

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS



*Harvard Divinity School
For Use of the Library*

VOLUME ONE

1956-1957

WESTON COLLEGE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
WESTON 93, MASSACHUSETTS

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS

VOLUME 1 SPRING 1957 NUMBER 3

Editor

J. J. COLLINS

Prof. New Testament

Associate Editors

B. C. CONNOLLY
Librarian

J. J. WALSH
Prof. Dogmatic Theology

Managing Editor

J. J. McGRATH

Business Manager

W. C. McINNES

Assistant Editors

J. F. BARRY
V. M. BURNS
R. J. CHENEY
J. G. CORNELLIER
J. T. HAMEL
H. J. MURPHY
J. W. O'NEIL
J. A. PAQUET
R. E. VARNERIN
J. P. WALSH

Business Staff

J. J. DONOHUE
J. H. DUGGAN
J. M. MURPHY
W. M. SHEA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
List of Abstractors, Staff	166
Abbreviations, Sigla	166

PERIODICAL ABSTRACTS

Inspiration, Texts, Versions, Interpretation, NT General	167
Gospels (General)	172
Synoptic Gospels	177
Gospel of St. John	182
Characters of the Gospels	186
Acts of the Apostles	188
Epistles of St. Paul	190
Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse	193
Biblical Theology	194
Archaeology	207
Dead Sea Scrolls	211
Apocrypha, Early Church	218

BOOKS AND OPINIONS

Synoptics	221
Four Books on Paul	223
Johannine Writings	226
New Testament Theology	229
The Bultmann Debate	231
Addenda	236

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Books Received	240
Editorial Notice	240
Cumulative Scripture Index—Volume 1	245
Cumulative Author Index—Volume 1	248

An abstract is an objective summary of an article or review. The contents of an abstract, therefore, are not necessarily the opinions of the editors of NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS; the views offered on disputed biblical questions remain the opinions of the original authors.

LIST OF ABTRACTORS, STAFF, ABBREVIATIONS, SIGLA

LIST OF ABSTRACTORS

Unless otherwise indicated, abstractors are members of Weston College, theologate of the Jesuit Province of New England.

Also contributing to NTA are some from the following Jesuit theologates: Innsbruck, Austria; Montréal, Canada; St. Marys, Kansas; Toronto, Canada; West Baden, Ind.; and Woodstock, Md.

Abbott (WMA) Lect. Greek Lit. and Philos.; *Alcina* (FA); *Barry* (JFB); *Bastian* (RJB) West Baden; *Bennett* (JTB); *Bligh*, S.J. (JFBL) Rome; *Blinzler* (JBz) Prof. NT Exegesis, Passau, Germany; *Bresnahan* (JFBr); *Brooks* (JEB); *Burns* (JABs) West Baden; *Callahan* (ERC) Prof. Dogmatic Theology; *Campbell* (RBC); *Cheney* (RC); *Collins* (JJC) Prof. New Testament and Biblical Greek; *Cornellier* (JGC); *Cortes* (JBC); *Creighton* (MEC) West Baden; *Curran* (TMC); *Dalton*, S.J. (WJD) Prof. New Testament, Melbourne, Australia; *Decker* (NFD); *Dulin* (JTD) West Baden; *Dulles* (ARD) Woodstock College; *Dunn* (RVD) Lect. Hebrew Lang. and Lit.; *Egan* (WTE); *Feeney* (WJF); *Ferrick* (RTF); *Foley* (DJF); *German* (GGm); *Gesing* (JBG) West Baden; *Giblin* (CHG) West Baden; *Graystone*, S.M. (GG) Prof. Sacred Scripture and Moral Theology St. Mary's Hill, Paignton, S. Devon. Eng.; *Henley* (FMH) West Baden; *Hernandez* (MH); *Ise-necker* (LEI) West Baden; *Jarski* (JCJ); *Johnson* (TAJ); *Jolson* (AJJ); *Kelly* (KK) Upholland College, Wigan, Lancs.; *Kerdiejus* (JBK); *King* (WFK) West Baden; *Krolikowski* (WPK) West Baden; *Kuchler* (WK) Passau; *Langevin* (PEL) L'Immaculée-Conception, Montréal; *Levy* (HAL); *Macomber* (WFM); *Mantautas* (VAM) West Baden; *Martin* (LM); *Mausolf*, O.F.M. Cap. (IJM) Prof. New Testament, St. Anthony Friary, Marathon, Wisconsin; *Miller* (EFM) West Baden; *Moriarty* (FLM) Dean of Theology—Prof. Old Testament and Hebrew; *Musurillo*, S.J. (HMs) Prof. Latin and Greek Lang., Plattsburgh, New York; *North*, S.J. (RN) Dir. Pont. Bibl. Inst. Jerusalem; *O'Connor* (JEO'C); *O'Keefe* (VO'K) Prof. Fundamental Theology, Woodstock College; *O'Rourke* (JO'R) Prof. New Testament St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Philadelphia; *O'Toole* (LJO'T); *Richard* (RLR); *Ryan* (PJR); *Twomey* (RLT) Lect. Hebrew Lang.; *Willmering* (HW) Prof. New Testament, St. Marys, Kansas.

Editorial Assistants

J. V. Borgo	R. J. Cote	D. D. Lynch	G. L. McLaughlin	L. M. St. Onge
	E. X. Canning	J. A. Donohoe	P. J. McKenna	
	R. F. Olson	J. T. Sheehan		

ABBREVIATIONS

Well-known theological sources, handbooks, and collections are cited by initials only, in italics, without periods, e.g., *PG* and *PL* for Migne's collections, *DB* for Denzinger's *Enchiridion*, *DTC* for *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, etc. But the following abbreviations, without periods, are not italicized in NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS:

DV	Douay Version	NT	New Testament
KJV	King James Version	OT	Old Testament
LXX	Septuagint	RSV	Revised Standard Version
MT	Massoretic Text	SS	Sacred Scripture

SIGLA

r indicates abstract of a book review

* indicates a non-Catholic author or publication

PERIODICAL ABSTRACTS

INSPIRATION, TEXTS, VERSIONS, INTERPRETATION, NT GENERAL

363. E. BENVENISTE, "Études sur quelques textes sogdiens chrétiens," *JA* 243 ('55) 297-338.

B studies unpublished Turfan manuscripts containing a Sogdian gospel based on the Peshitta, as well as a new Acts of Martyrs and an Antirrheticus of Evagrius of Pontus.—R. N.

364. W. J. DALTON, "St. Jerome on the Inspiration and Inerrancy of Scripture," *AusCRec* 33 ('56) 313-320.

St. Jerome is a model for the modern Catholic exegete in the way he faced the Scripture problems of his day. His teaching on inspiration is incomplete and fragmentary, but touches the main elements. The divine nature of the Scriptures is an idea underlying all that he wrote. He did not get very far towards the solution of the problem presented by the two authors at work, God and the human writer; but he did insist that the human writer is truly an author and so reveals his personality in his work. Despite later misunderstandings of his views on the inerrancy of the Bible, he upheld this truth with the greatest tenacity and vigour, and that in the face of the greatest difficulties. The modern renaissance of biblical studies is strikingly in accord with his spirit.—W. J. D.

365. A. DESROCHES, "L'élément formel de l'inspiration," *RUO* 26 ('56) 215-234.

The Fathers early recognized that God directly influenced the product of the inspired writer. Any investigation of the intellectual nature of inspiration should not overlook the importance of the cooperation between God and the inspired writer according to Augustine, whose ideas were philosophically explained and accommodated to the Aristotelian theory of knowledge by St. Thomas. Two notions, instrumentality and the intellectual character of inspiration, led St. Thomas to give primacy to inspired judgment; for truth is to be found first in the judgment of the intellect. As human knowledge consists in acquiring ideas and passing judgments on them, the gift of prophecy may stress either element or both, but the formal element of inspiration is found in the judgment. The precise roles of speculative and practical judgment are matters which call for greater development by scholars.—A. J. J.

366. W. EICHRODT, "Ist die typologische Exegese sachgemässe Exegese?" *TL** 81 ('56) 641-654.

In recent years typology has received much attention from J. Daniélou, J. Coppens, H. Bornkamm, D. Lerch, G. von Rad, and F. Baumgärtel. Not to

be confused with allegory, nor with the exhortatory application of an OT event to a present situation, typology is the correspondence between the Old and New Testaments such that objects of the one (types) foreshadow corresponding objects of the other (antitypes). The justification for seeing this correlation arises from the conviction that with Christ a new era of salvation commenced and that the hand of God has manifestly directed all the past toward this new era. Against typological exegesis some have argued strongly, among them R. Bultmann and F. Baumgärtel. The objection has been raised that typology supposes a concept of history prevalent in the ancient East but quite foreign to Israel, namely, that events are repeated in a recurrent cycle. To this, one may reply that in the Bible the past is considered to be pointing toward a future eschatological era (a relation of *Urzeit* to *Endzeit*). Another difficulty presented is that the types are not truly historical events and that the OT view of history differed essentially from ours. On examination, however, this difficulty is not a decisive one. Granting even the value of typology, one can claim that its use does not fall within the province of the exegete whose task concerns the explanation of the word. A more accurate concept of the exegete's function, however, would include the exposition of the full meaning of the text including its setting in the history of salvation. Finally, typology admittedly begins with a presupposition, namely, that salvation appeared in Christ and that God has for centuries been preparing for that event. Fortunately, in recent times scholars are recognizing that such an assumption is no more arbitrary or purely subjective than assumptions commonly used in other sciences.—J. J. C.

367. R. E. GIBSON, "Communicating the Gospel," *Interpretation** 10 ('56) 400-410.

Though preacher communication (and hearer response) is essential to the Church's life and man's salvation, it presents a tremendous problem. The difficulty stems from many fonts. (1) The gospel message is partially a mystery. (2) Its language necessarily expresses a paradoxical meeting of history and infinity in terms which many logical positivists regard as essentially emotional and, at best, casually related to rational truth. (3) Laymen expect its message to be stated in simplifications and are therefore prone to accept the inadequate or the irrelevant (e.g., the unity movement and N. V. Peale's, *Power of Positive Thinking*) as of the faith. (4) Recent, praiseworthy theological development (e.g., Karl Barth's work) broadens the chasm between religious truth and the laity. (5) Preachers are often unaware of the real problems of modern man to which the gospel must be applied. (6) Modern man by no means realizes his essential sinfulness. He cannot therefore accept the gospel addressed to him on this essential but subjectively meaningless level. Solution: The preacher must work towards a total affirmation, i.e., an oblation (independent of final scientific conclusions) of the whole self to God. He must testify to the gospel as the sole and ultimate answer to man's sinfulness and

life's tragedies. And he must do so despite the fact that absolute certainty regarding the gospel message is impossible.—M. E. C.

368. S. GIET, "Un procédé littéraire d'exposition: l'anticipation chronologique," *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 2 ('56) 243-253.

In the parable of the Wedding Feast, Mt 22:2-9, Christ pictures the king as first sending out his armies to punish the murderers of his servants and only then proceeding to invite others to replace his intended guests. Vaccari has pointed out that this represents an inversion of the chronological sequence of events. A study of Flavius Josephus and other ancient historians shows that chronological anticipation was a common procedure in antiquity. At times, adequate indications of the anticipation are supplied by the author so that no confusion results, but this is not always the case. As a result, a writer may mention the same event several times in different connections without any sign that he is doing so. Consequently, when the same sort of event is repeated in the course of a narrative, one should not jump to the conclusion that it actually happened twice. Thus, in Acts 11:28-30 and 12:25, Luke, in whose writings the device of chronological anticipation is frequent (e.g., Lk 1:80, 3:20, 4:37 and Acts 8:1), mentions twice a trip made by Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem for the purpose of bringing alms to help the victims of a famine. The second mention occurs in its correct chronological sequence; the first is an instance of chronological anticipation in connection with the prediction of the famine by the prophet Agabus.—W. F. M.

369. A. GIL ULECIA, "En el Centenario de la Biblia de Gutenberg" *EstBib* ('56) 279-285.

Der Text der Gutenbergbibel zu ihrem 500 jachrigen Jubilacum untersucht (volume VII of the collection *Bonner Biblische Beitrage*) by H. Schneider of Gutenberg University, Mainz, vindicates the true importance of Gutenberg's Bible from a study of old Bible MSS preserved in the libraries of Darmstadt, Frankfurt, Giessen, Coblenz, Mainz, Munich, Wurzburg, London, Paris, and Rome. The substantial reproduction in the Gutenberg Bible of the standard Sorbonne text (despite marked differences known to scholars) led H. Quentin to the conclusion (often repeated since his "Mémoire sur l'établissement du texte de la Vulgate," Paris: 1922) that Gutenberg merely universalized the Sorbonne text. Schneider's survey of 81 chapters in 34 MSS of the 6th to 13th centuries (by means of the critical apparatus of the Benedictine edition of the Roman Vulgate) shows that, of 249 variations, 179 are Parisian—a fact that explains why Gutenberg's text is substantially the same as the Sorbonne text. However, in the same 81 chapters, there are 228 readings peculiar to the Gutenberg text. Schneider compares these with 44 MSS of the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries, most of them from the city or region of Mainz, and concludes that 26 of the MSS coincide with the peculiar readings of the Gutenberg text. Thus, it is clear that Gutenberg's text not only has a source in common with

the Sorbonne text but also has a tradition that is peculiar to it and well-rooted in the Rhine area.—F. A.

370. N. A. HUFFMAN, "Revised Catalogue Data on Greek Gospel MSS in Italy," *NovT** 1 ('56) 156-160.

The lists compiled around 1900 by Gregory and Von Soden are still remarkably complete, but here some revisions are indicated because of the loss or the moving of MSS. Their location and condition is given accurately, but H did not check the catalogue descriptions thoroughly. He did not complete the check at the Vatican and St. Mark's in Venice but presumes they are intact. At Turin a fire in 1904 destroyed all Oriental codices except one, most of the French, some Greek, Latin, and Italian. The others were damaged and restored with varying success. At the National Library, Naples, are MSS taken to Vienna in 1714-33 and returned to Naples after World War I. Ferrara Univ. Lib. 187 (c. 1334 A.D.) is divided into modern chapters. H gives lists and descriptions of these MSS as well as those at Palermo, Rome, and Syracuse.—J. T. B.

371. V. MARTIN, "Un nouveau codex de papyrus du quatrième Evangile," *ETL* 32 ('56) 547-548.

The Bodmer Library in Cologny near Geneva possesses a papyrus codex containing the first fourteen chapters of the Gospel of John. The sections of which it is composed do not have the same number of leaves, are in general well preserved, and give evidence of an archaic binding system. The small, almost squared format is like that of the Rylands papyrus 457 and the Egerton 2, both of which are dated in the second century. The script is uncial, carefully done. The manuscript belongs to the Roman epoch, and the reign of Diocletian can be set as the lower limit. It is certainly not before 150 but is undoubtedly a witness of remarkable antiquity and the most extensive of the papyri on this Gospel. The only important lacuna is the leaf containing 6:11-35. The variant readings do not modify the usual form of the Gospel. The codex does not have 5:4 (the angel at the pool) nor 7:53-8:11 (adulterous woman) but does have *ou gar sunchrontai hoi Ioudaioi Samareitais* of 4:9. Generally speaking it sides with Sinaiticus and Vaticanus though a good century earlier than they are.—V. O'K.

372. L. H. SIBERMAN, "Survey of Current Theological Literature," *Judaism** 5 ('56) 357-364.

Jacob Taubes in his article, "Theology and the Philosophic Critique of Religion" (*ZRG* VIII, 2), questions the value of the new biblical theology. Theology has the task of transferring the original symbols in a new fashion to fit the present situation. These symbols arose at a point in history, but now they no longer coincide with man's experience. Therefore a transfer must be

made. Taubes traces the thought of K. Barth through the successive editions of his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* to the *Kirchliche Dogmatik*. The study of Romans was an attempt to arrive at the God beyond conventional theology. *Dogmatik*, Taubes says, is "a witness of the creative situation." The time has come when theology can do without the support of canon and classical authorities. S holds that the Bible spoke "not *through* a system, but *to* the situation to man. The Bible was the Word (*dibbur* not *logos*) speaking to the need of the hour."—R. V. D.

373. N. G. SMITH, "Imagination In Exegesis," *Interpretation** 10 ('56) 420-426.

Man's creative imagination has greatly advanced the frontiers of human knowledge. Even Scripture itself is the product of inspired religious imagination. The Psalmist speaks of the Lord as his shepherd. Therefore both creative and sympathetic imagination are needed for interpreting and reading the Bible. To determine the total meaning of a Scripture text all lexical and grammatical aids are essential, but the final and fruitful step is the interpreter's imagination trying to determine what is said and perhaps why it is said in that particular way. Sometimes a text means less than it says: "If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee." At other times a text may mean more than it says: "As a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." Since the Bible is partly poetic, we must read it with a sympathetic imagination. If we imagine the sensations and emotions of the poet in a particular situation, then we share his experience and capture his meaning. An invaluable aid to exegesis, therefore, is the reconstruction of a historical setting. When Jesus decided to return to Judea, Thomas said, "Let us also go, that we may die with him." Was Thomas fatalistic or loyal? By going back in imagination we examine the situation and its psychological factors. Of course such exegesis is always built on facts. Imaginative insight faces the facts. It does not fabricate fantasies.—J. B. G.

374. K. WEITZMANN, "Narration in Early Christendom," *AJA* 61 ('57) 83-91.

One of six papers in a symposium entitled "Narration in Ancient Art," this article traces the development of storytelling by pictures. Papyrus rolls were early illustrated with individual sketches. With the change to parchment codices, these sketches were condensed into an extended cyclic narrative representing in a single frame several phases of one episode. These miniature cycles were further abbreviated when copied by monumental artists in mosaics and frescoes. From similarities between manuscript illustrations of Christian bibles and earlier frescoes in a synagogue, W tentatively postulates a common archetype, Jewish manuscript illustrations, on which Christian artists depended. Several plates illustrate the article.—L. J. O'T.

375. H. ZORN, "Notes on Translation of the Malayalam Bible," *CTM** 28 ('57) 110-117.

Malayalam is used along the southwest coast of India. The rule "If in doubt, translate literally" is fallacious because a literal translation may cause more misunderstanding than a clumsy effort at an equivalent effect. Isolated words cause the greatest problem; for God *Daivam* is used, a word with common gender and not the masculine word. Certain figures and comparisons cause difficulty because their basis is unknown to the people. The use of honorific titles causes difficulty because of popular usage. Theological expressions often force the translators to give a new meaning to a Hindu word or to coin a new word. Precisions found in Malayalam and not found in Hebrew or Greek can cause difficulty.—J. O'R.

GOSPELS (GENERAL)

376. BALTOWSKI, "Gdzie Apostołowie byli w czasie męki Pana Jezusa?" ["Where were the Apostles during the Passion of the Lord Jesus?"] *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny (De Actione Biblica et Liturgica)* 9 ('56) 82-92.

The common opinion that the apostles were absent throughout the Passion of our Lord does not do justice to the pertinent NT passages. The prophecy Mt 26:31-32 has the word *tonight*, which clearly indicates that the prophecy was to be fulfilled that very night and does not extend to the next day. On that night, the command not to resist with force (Jn 18:11, Mt 27:52, Lk 22:51) and the surrender of our Lord to the enemies caused the apostles' flight (Mt 26:56, Mk 14:50). From this point in the Passion, except for Judas' betrayal, Peter's denial, and John's presence beneath the cross, there is no explicit mention of the apostles.

Were the apostles present on Calvary? We know John was there. As for the others, Lk 23:49 distinguishes clearly between the common people *ochloi*, and our Lord's acquaintances *gnostoi*, who are not the pious women. There is no reason to exclude the apostles. Moreover, Mt 27:62-65 indicates that the Pharisees were aware of the disciples' presence on Calvary. This interpretation cannot be contradicted by the fact in Jn 20:19 that "... the doors were shut, where the disciples were gathered together, for fear of the Jews," because this text refers to the evening of the third day after the Crucifixion. They shut themselves up only when they heard the slanders being spread against them by the bribed soldiers. Thus Lk 23:49 ("... all His acquaintances ... stood afar off, beholding these things") may be taken as the vindication of their presence on Calvary.—J. C. J.

377. H. BOUMAN, "The Baptism of Christ with Special Reference to the Gift of the Spirit," *CTM** 28 ('57) 1-14.

By the baptism certainty was effected in John that the mission of Jesus was divinely wrought. The descent of the Spirit signified the public declaration

from the Father that the Messianic work of Jesus in His threefold office was to begin. The soteriological aspect is paramount. The voice from heaven is a most remarkable demonstration of the Trinity.—J. O'R.

378. J. BRINKTRINE, "Die Selbstaussage Jesu *Ego Eimi*," *TG* 47 ('57) 34-36.

In all four Gospels our Lord repeatedly speaks of Himself as *ego eimi*; e.g., while walking on the Sea of Galilee, Mt 14:27; Mk 6:51; Jn 6:21; which translators and exegetes render, "it is I"; again when Christ appears to His apostles after the Resurrection, Lk 24:36, 39. B finds this interpretation too weak, because *ego eimi* expresses more than the mere human identity of Jesus. He substantiates this by citing Jn 8:24, 28, 57 ff., where Jesus is defending His divine sonship and equality with the Father; also in Jn 13:18 f., where He foretells His betrayal. In these passages *ego eimi* clearly indicates Christ's divine nature. Compare these NT passages with the LXX version of Dt 32:39; Is 43:10; 46:4, and no less than thirty passages in Ezechiel, and notice that *ego eimi* identifies the God of Israel. Therefore, in the above mentioned NT passages *ego eimi* identifies Jesus Christ with Yahweh, and is an echo of *ego eimi ho on* (Ex 3:4). This interpretation brings the Synoptic Gospels closer to the Fourth Gospel in maintaining the divinity of Jesus Christ, and no longer makes Mt 11:27 stand out like an isolated passage.—H. W.

379. N. KRIEGER, "Barfuss Busse Tun," *NovT** 1 ('56) 227-228.

John the Baptist claimed he was not worthy to bear Christ's sandals (Mt 3:11). Does this expression, especially since it differs from that used by the other Evangelists in the corresponding places (Mk 1:7, Lk 3:16, Jn 1:27), suggest a ritual followed by the Baptist? The Jews had a penitential practice of walking barefoot. Perhaps John demanded the shoes of his disciples as a sign of their willingness to do penance. John cannot demand Jesus' shoes because He does not need the penance to which John calls men. Clearly a metaphor, the expression does, nevertheless, seem to reflect John's practice.—J. B. K.

380. J. MICHL, "Fragen um das Leichentuch von Turin," *TQ* 163 ('56) 129-173.

Ten pages of this article are devoted to a discussion of whether the evidence from the Gospels on the manner of Christ's burial does not exclude all possibility that the Holy Shroud of Turin is genuine. M follows Braun, Zähringer, Card. Innitzer, Blinzler, and Gächter, who all hold, with varying degrees of emphasis, that it is best to be skeptical about the Shroud. Mt 27:59, Mk 15:46 (*eneilêsen*) and Lk 23:53 show that the linen cloth (*sindôn*) was wound round and round the body, and Jn 20:5-7 shows that the head of Christ was covered by a separate cloth (*sudarion*). The Shroud can be neither the *sindôn* nor the *sudarion*; (if genuine) it must have lain flat on the slab of the tomb. Could the Shroud then be another cloth in which the body, still unwashed, was placed temporarily on

Friday night? It seems unlikely that there was no time to wash the body on Friday or that Joseph of Arimathea used the 100 pounds of aloes (Jn 19:39) on Friday evening—the final anointing of the body was to have been done on Sunday morning (Mk 16:1 & par.). Nor is it probable that any of the early Christians would have preserved the Shroud as a relic, since possession of it would have involved permanent ritual uncleanness for the possessor.—J. F. Bl.

381. S. ROSENBLATT, "The Crucifixion of Jesus from the Standpoint of Pharisaic Law," *JBL** 75 ('56) 315-321.

The Dead Sea Scrolls have disclosed the religious ferment which produced a number of religious sects in Palestine in the first century A.D. Of these only Pharisaism and Christianity have survived, and the Pharisees are the principal enemy of the Savior in the NT. Their part in the Crucifixion is still of absorbing interest. The execution by Roman soldiers fits the juridical status of Jews in Judea. The Pharisees offered the most formidable ideological opposition to Jesus of Nazareth. The question is whether the antagonism was such as to lead to a demand for His death. Neither the laxity of His disciples, no greater than that which was not unusual among the common people, nor His sectarian views, which were less removed from Pharisaism than were the views of the Sadducees, were of a character to elicit violence. If the Pharisees were as strict as they are represented in the NT, they could have had nothing to do with either the trial or the Crucifixion, which violated the Law in almost every detail. His claims as stated in the NT could not have been construed as blasphemous under Pharisaic law. It is unlikely that the Pharisees plotted His death at the hands of the Romans; Jewish tradition has always rejected informing on a fellow-Jew to a hated alien government. If Pharisees were among the persons responsible, they must have been a hypocritical type known from other sources and repudiated by Pharisaism. The Crucifixion was an act of the Romans, aided and abetted by Jewish quislings such as Judas Iscariot. The Pharisees were blamed in the NT because Christianity had become a Gentile sect, and it would have been impolitic to blame a Gentile government.—C. H. G.

382. M. SABBE, "Tempelreiniging en Tempellogion," *ColBG* 2 ('56) 289-299.

John early in his Gospel links the cleansing of the Temple with the Jews' request for a sign and Christ's granting the sign of the Temple (Jn 2:13-22). The Synoptics place the cleansing at the end of the public life, at the final official break with the high priests, scribes and elders. Matthew and Mark mention the sign of the Temple in connection with false witnesses at Jesus' trial. When did the cleansing actually take place? Some argue for the chronology of the Synoptics, others for that of John, others for two cleansings; some claim that both accounts are merely symbolic, others that the cleansing occurred early, while the sign of the Temple occurred late. Since, however, the Gospels are not primarily biographies, many chronological questions can

never be answered with certainty. It is better to approach the data from the viewpoint of the literary and theological motives which guided the Evangelists in the process of composition. The Synoptics weave into the structure of Jesus' great discourses a series of pericopes pointing to Christ's death and resurrection, at the climax of which they place the entry into Jerusalem and the cleansing of the Temple. After this the events foreshadowed begin to take place. John has a different literary-theological motivation and, hence, a different structure. Some see in the early presentation of the Cana miracle together with the cleansing an intent to symbolize Christ's revelation of Himself as Messiah, first in Galilee then in Jerusalem, or an intent to symbolize the beginning and end of Jesus' acts. The rest of the Gospel then recounts these acts in detail. John's basic care seems to be to describe the revelation of Jesus first in its relation to the faith of his disciples, then in its relation to the unbelief of the Jews. The Cana-cleansing pericope presents this contrast for the first time; the rest of the Gospel continues it by relating alternately Galilean and Judean episodes. These are not chronologically ordered, but do have as an historical basis several journeys to Jerusalem.

The Synoptics picture Christ's entry into Jerusalem and the cleansing of the Temple as Messianic, in the tradition of a prophetic reformer like Jeremiah, to whom they allude. In John the episode has still more pronounced Messianic character, due to the events of ch. 1 and the allusion to Ps 69 and Mal 3. The pericope also exemplifies John's care to show Christ revealing Himself to His disciples, a revelation fully understood only after Christ's Resurrection.—W. J. F.

383. M. SABBE, "Tempelreiniging en Tempellogion (II)," *ColBG* 2 ('56) 466-480.

The new Jerusalem with its temple "not made by human hands," conceived now as earthly but built by Yahweh, now more spiritually as descending from heaven, played a central role in the Messianic expectations of the Jews. Christianity further spiritualized this concept seeing the new Jerusalem as the Church, and the temple no longer as a building but as God Himself and the Lamb. The sign of the temple is best understood as a Messianic affirmation which the Jews misinterpreted in the light of their own Messianic hopes. In John the correct spiritual interpretation is given with explicit reference to the Resurrection. The "three days" found also in the Synoptics hint at the same. Whatever the form of the original prophecy, it certainly had not the same meaning for Christ's hearers that it did for the Evangelists and later Christians.—W. J. F.

384. PH. SCHMIDT, "Etwas über den Stern der Weisen," *Klerusblatt* 35 ('55) 507-508.

The conjecture put forth in the periodical *Verborgene Welt* of Nov. 15, 1955, that the star of the wise men could have been an astral body, is fantastic, and, since the astral body is a product of theosophy, unchristian.—J. Bz.

385. H.-G. TROADEC, "Aux confins des deux Alliances," *BiViChrét* 16 ('56-'57) 19-32.

John the Baptist brings the OT to its completion, in preparation for the coming of the Messiah. (1) His family has immersed him in the OT atmosphere. Zachary is the type of the just man whose faith has not been sufficiently strengthened by the Law. The Baptist, for his part, appears after the example of Elijah as a threatening prophet, a herald of the imminent divine wrath. He preaches the purifying asceticism under which Israel has labored for centuries. He unmasks the pharisaic twistings of this law of whose holy exigencies he reminds Herod. (2) John represents also the uprooted Jew who wonders if Christ truly fulfills the expectations of Israel: "Are you the one who is to come?" (Lk 7:19) He does not guess that through baptism Jesus fulfills the Old Covenant. The way of life adopted by Jesus stuns him. Above all, the mission of love carried on by the Messiah baffles this tempestuous man who has been preaching a baptism of fire. In his OT outlook, the Baptist has confused Messianism with parousia. (3) But he goes beyond Judaism in acknowledging his insufficiency, as well as in condemning a proud law. He stands at the threshold of the New Covenant to bring in his own people.—P. E. L. .:

386. J. TRUMPP, "Der Stern der Weisen aus dem Morgenland," *Standard* (hrsg. von der Standard Telephon und Radio A. G., Zürich) 12 ('57) 12-15.

Jesus was born in the first consular year of Publius Sulpicius Quirinius and Marcus Valerius Mesala Barbatas, when Quirinius was governor of Syria, i.e., in the year 12 B.C.—J. Bz.

387. N. WALKER, "The Dating of the Last Supper," *JQR** 47 ('57) 293-295.

The *Parasque* or Pro-Sabbaton was the period from sunset Thursday to sunset Friday. It was taken up entirely with preparations for the paschal feast, celebrated after sunset Friday. The Last Supper, betrayal, arrest, Crucifixion, and burial of Jesus occurred on this *Parasque*. Both Mark and John, though using different time reckonings, agree that Jesus was crucified at 9 A.M. If Jesus was crucified at 9 A.M., this allows six hours for His bleeding to death (the 9th hour of Mark records His death). In an appended note S. Zeitlin reaffirms his position that, according to the Synoptics, Jesus was crucified on the first day of Passover and the Last Supper was the Passover Meal. In John, however, Jesus was crucified on the eve of Passover, on *Parasque*, and the Last Supper (Thursday) was an ordinary meal.—F. L. M.

388. R. McL. WILSON, "Did Jesus Speak Greek?," *ExpT** 68 ('57) 121-122.

A. W. Argyle *ExpT** 67 ('56) 383 has misread Dalman to conclude that 'the kingdom' in four cited cases of Mt is definitely not Semitic, on the grounds that this word does not stand for the sovereignty of God unless so qualified. But in three of the four cases (Mt 8:11-12, 13:19, 13:38) the required definition

is given in the context. On Mt 5:39-40, Argyle notes Is 50:6-8 in LXX and observes that the Hebrew is quite different. But Mt 5:39-40 is not a quotation. Christ's words echo Isaiah. Some early Christian, perhaps the Evangelist himself, recognizing this familiar echo, may have employed the vocabulary of that passage to render the saying into Greek. Another difficulty presents itself: if the saying were originally uttered in Greek, it must have been to a Greek-speaking audience, a theory that "might well create more problems than it solves."—R. L. R.

SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

389. A. GEORGE, "Le Père et le Fils dans les évangiles synoptiques," *LumVi* 29 ('56) 603-616.

The images of Father and Son, which Jesus constantly employed to define His relations with God, appear under the most varied literary forms: narratives, parables, prayers, eschatological or parenetic phrases. It is clear that so solidly attested a theme (at least thirty different passages in the Synoptics) is an incontestable expression of Jesus and a central element in His thought. A celebrated text unites the mysteries of Father and of Son in one single proclamation: Mt 11:27; Lk 10:22.

What does the divine filiation signify to Jesus? His speech and actions manifest a consciousness of exceptional relations with God. The Father is above all the indisputable authority, the head of the family, the assured protector, the benefactor. For Jesus as well as for all Israel He is "the Lord." The Son adores Him and unreservedly submits Himself to His will. Jesus has but one end in view: The Kingdom of God, the glory of His Father.

This unique filiation is glimpsed in some of His actions whereby He assumes an authority that is properly divine. His singular consciousness of being the envoy of God, explains the strange announcement: "Thy sins are forgiven." Sent by God in the wake of and superseding the prophets, He claims powers which are properly divine. He assumes a unique role in the salvation of His people and of each one of His faithful. There is a mystery of the Son as well as a mystery of the Father. No one can attain it except by grace . . . Mt 11:27; 16:16. Today as in the first days of the gospel, the Father and the Son are the loftiest expression of the mystery of God.—J. G. C.

390. T. CONSIDINE, "Except it be for Fornication," *AusCRec* 33 ('56) 214-223.

In Mt 5:32 and 19:9, the word *porneia* has always presented difficulties. In both cases there seems to be question of an exception to the indissolubility of marriage. A possible solution lies in the meaning of *porneia* familiar to the Jews both in the OT and in the NT: willful rejection of God and His Christ. Thus we have here, in these texts, another example of NT teaching on the power of the Church to dissolve legitimate marriages in favour of the faith, a power found in the Pauline privilege.—W. J. D.

391. F. V. FILSON, "Broken Patterns in the Gospel of Matthew," *JBL** 75 ('56) 227-231.

The author of Matthew, drawing upon an earlier oral and written tradition, subordinated symmetry of pattern to thought and topical connection. Where numerical or symmetrical patterns already existed, he broke or at least extended them to include further material. In the parable discourse of ch. 13 he added to the Marcan structural pattern and destroyed the unity. Other possible additions may be in the Beatitudes and prohibitions in ch. 5. After the first antithesis of 5:21-22, he sacrifices structural to topical unity by adding two units from tradition. The clearest example of inserting topically related material into an originally symmetrical structure is in ch. 6:1-18 where vv. 7-15 are topically in place but ruin the pattern and symmetry. Who first constructed the patterns which the author of Matthew altered? They may have come from Jesus. More probably, they came from the early Jewish-Christian teachers who in their oral instruction arranged the tradition in patterns to aid the memory and clear understanding. Coming later, the writer of Matthew reflects but does not directly record early oral tradition.—L. E. I.

392. N. TURNER, "The New-Born King—Mt 2:2," *ExpT** 68 ('57) 122.

In the Greek of Mt, attributive use of the participle in connection with an articular substantive generally follows the order: article, substantive, article, participle, additional matter. Exceptions occur, however, in the 'legendary' passages, and here a new arrangement is uniform: article, attributive participle, substantive (Mt 2:7, 17:27, 25:34, 27:52). The phenomenon may indicate use of a different Greek source. At any rate, it does throw light on Mt 2:2. Taking *techtheis* substantively and *basileus* predicatively, we can render the text: "He that is born King of the Jews." But proximity to Mt 2:7 makes it more probable that the construction is again: article, attributive participle, substantive, and should be rendered: "The born (or new-born) King of the Jews." In the latter reading, the astrologers are concerned for the moment with the 'where' of Christ's birth, and emphasis is not on the great One ('who') just born, which would be pompous and out of character.—R. L. R.

393. B. WILLAERT, "'Tu es Petrus', Mt XVI, 17-19" *ColBG* 2 ('56) 452-465.

As against O. Cullmann, W maintains that the primacy text rightly follows the Petrine confession. He offers three reasons: (1) a literary comparison shows that Mt is more archaic in form than Mk; (2) the terms used (Son of Man, *apokaluptein*, kingdom of heaven) are a definite reference to the prophecy of Daniel (7:13); (3) structural unity is evident in Christ's question, used to introduce a doctrinal discourse. With Bultmann he finds problematic not the presence of the text in Mt, but rather its absence in Mk. To solve the difficult juxtaposition of Christ's blessing and reproaching Peter, W has recourse to an earlier gospel used by Mt and Mk. The Evangelists, seeing the problem, solved it each in his own way: Mt, with a definite editorial stop after the Petrine con-

fession, starts a new section with the first Passion prediction; Mk simply omits the primacy text. W feels that the confession originally served as an introduction to the Community Discourse (Mt 18) because (1) in the Gospel the word *ekklesia* is found nowhere else but in the two sections in question; (2) in both texts Peter, in contrast with the other apostles, is shown in closer relationship with Christ; (3) there is a slightly more obscure reference to Dan 7:13 in the Community Discourse. As an hypothesis W proposes that the main point of Mt 16:21 to 17:22 is the "suffering glory of the Son-of-Man concept." This passage may have been placed between the confession and the Community Discourse as a result of reworking two distinct gospels (one dealing with the Galilean period, the other with the Passion cycle), or for a historico-biographical note, or for a theological reason. The latter would be to show the relation between the eternal glory of the kingdom of heaven and the Son of Man's earthly suffering. It would be then a reinterpretation, a completing of the Son-of-Man concept, which may be stated somewhat as follows: Although Christ be the Son of Man mentioned by Daniel, He must, nevertheless, in accordance with His Father's will, suffer and die. This same idea is expressed in Lk 17:25 and 24:26. —D. J. F.

394. C. E. Faw, "The Heart of the Gospel of Mark," *JBR** 24 ('56) 77-82.

Located just past midway in the Gospel of Mark, 8:27-10:45 has been called by many the central section or "the way of the cross." Set apart by the change of mood and by the threefold prediction of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, this group of verses constitutes a distinct section with a fitting introduction, sc. Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, and an apt conclusion, sc. the rank and greatness among Christians which closes with the well-known ransom text (10:45). Not infrequently interpreters have concentrated almost solely on the negative aspects of this section i.e., the prophecies of the Passion, and have overlooked the positive aspects in the promise of the Resurrection. As a summary of the thought of this unit, one may take three questions and answers: Who is Jesus? What kind of Messiah is He? And what kind of disciples will this Messiah have? The answers are: Jesus is the Messiah; the suffering-servant; and His disciples like Him will find life through death.

Mk 8:27-10:45 is closely connected with what precedes because of the positive feature of Jesus' immense popularity and authority and the negative features of opposition from the scribes and the shallowness of the crowd. It is linked with what follows, because the section prepares for the Passion and the glory of the Resurrection. One might object that such a reading of Mark attributes to him a degree of artfulness unwarranted by his artless literary style. But this carelessness has been exaggerated, and furthermore, authors today recognize that Mark had his theological presuppositions. From what has been written we can understand that this section is the clue to the understanding of the entire Gospel. The readers also learn that greatness comes from being servants of all.

This Marcan section therefore merits a place along with the sublimest portions of the Gospels e.g. the Sermon on the Mount, the Last Discourse—this plus the fact that it is the oldest of them all.—J. J. C.

395. W. MANSON, "The Purpose of the Parables: A Re-Examination of St. Mark iv. 10-12," *ExpT** 68 ('57) 132-135.

Critical analysis proves that these verses embody the authentic language of Jesus and that Mark's text is ancient and the primary Synoptic version of the saying. Dissatisfied with other interpretations, particularly with the view that Jesus used parables to conceal the truth, M proposes a new theory. Mark suggests that Jesus was fulfilling the work of Isaiah and the saying would mean that He used parables to communicate the truth. The words that people have eyes to see but do not perceive recall the commission of Isaiah (Is 6:1-10) who was sent by God to preach and to fail. Jesus, however, will fulfill Isaiah's commission not by failing but by succeeding (cf. Is 42:4). In Isaiah's instructions nothing is said about teaching in parables, but Mark expressly states that the Savior will teach in parables, i.e., He will adapt His message to the universal intelligence. Our misunderstanding of Mark's words as stressing the lack of understanding comes from a failure to grasp the underlying Hebrew mode of expression which emphasizes rather the positive part: "that they may indeed see and not perceive." Again, Semitic coordinated clauses may entail subordination; when Christ thanks the Father for having revealed truths to the little ones, the concealment from the wise is subordinate: "I thank thee, Father, that while thou hast hid these things from the wise, thou has revealed them to children." Hence the present text would be: "that they may indeed see, *though* they do not perceive." Consequently "lest" or *mepote* in the final clause will refer to the emphasized part of the sentence and will embody the usage of *me* in cautious assertions, implying "a still open possibility." The meaning would be, "Indeed see . . . and indeed hear . . . *in case* they yet turn and are forgiven." Hence some idea is planted in the minds of the hearers which will grow later. According to this interpretation parables are used to teach the spiritual through the natural, to reject the nationalistic and apocalyptic Messianic notions, and to offer an approach to those not fully accepting the message of Christ. In general there are two groups of parables: the first, employing nature symbolism (e.g., the sower, the seed, the leaven) show Christ as the *Messias Absconditus*, who will not follow the temptations of Satan by forcibly establishing His kingdom; the second, employing human life symbolism and suggesting moral issues, illustrates the attempts of Christ to have His message accepted.—T. A. J.

396. H. A. Rigg, Jr., "Papias on Mark," *NovT** 1 ('56) 161-183.

A slight emendation in Papias' statement on Mark as the interpreter of Peter, quoted by Eusebius, will make the whole passage more sound in context and more in accord with modern conclusions about Mk. First, it is suggested that *suntaxis* be rendered "any special arrangement"; this could refer to Peter's lack of style and grammatical nicety in his teaching.

The crucial part, that "Mark . . . wrote down accurately all that he remembered, *not indeed in order . . .*," contradicts the findings of scholars. Let the text be read *ou mentoi tachei* instead of *taxei*, and there results the meaningful translation: "Mark . . . set down in writing accurately, indeed not at all hastily—in a slipshod manner. . . ." Linguistic similarity in sounds could explain the error, and Papias would thus be vindicating in the case of Mark the very method of listening and of later accurately recording, which he says in his prologue he himself employed. Papias would be denying as against contemporary critics of Mark that the brevity, seeming omissions, and possible troublesomeness of Mark's account, or the difficulties under which Mark wrote, or the existence of other purported Petrine writings were valid reasons for doubting that Mark did an accurate and authoritative job as the interpreter of Peter.—J. F. Br.

397. J. BAKER, "Luke, The Critical Evangelist," *ExpT** 68 ('57) 123-125.

Of all the Evangelists, Luke appears to be the most critical. A true Greek, his account manifests a 'reasonable' attitude in setting down his material and showing that the gospel of Jesus could stand firm in the face of reason. This is most clear in 'L,' but shows also in the adaptation of Mark and Q.

Theophilus of the prologue is a man of culture and intelligence to whom Luke will demonstrate the historicity and dependability of his narrative. The Nativity Narrative is close-knit. The Temple scene emphasizes the intelligence and understanding (*sunesis*) and wisdom (*sophia*) of the Christ Child. Later, Luke stresses Christ's power of argument (e.g., 14:6), and the nearly syllogistic form of His teaching method (e.g., 7:36-50). Throughout the Gospel, and again in Acts, we find the same desire to convince men by an appeal to their reason.

A possible tendency toward higher criticism may be seen in Luke's omission of the walking on the water, or his account of the Parable of the Barren Fig-Tree, regarding the latter, perhaps, as the true version of the incident or a rational explanation of what is recorded by Matthew and Mark. As another instance, and against the view of Jeremias, it seems that the addition (?) "for he saith, The old is better" (Lk 5:39) does not detract from the Lucan version of the new wine parable, but rather brings out Christ's reiterated complaint that He cannot get people to accept the new wine.—R. L. R.

398. H. GUY, "The Virgin Birth in St. Luke," *ExpT** 68 ('57) 157.

The assumption of H. E. W. Turner in *ExpT** 67 ('56) 12-17, that the virgin birth is established in Lk 1:34, does not seem justifiable. Because Mary was not then married, her reference to not knowing man looks only to the present. There is no indication that the child will have no earthly father. The proposed parallel with Elizabeth (1:36) fails, since no one suggested that the birth of John was virginal. Unless we take cognizance of the narrative in Mt, Mary could be considered as marrying later and having her son by Joseph.—T. A. J.

GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

399. F. M. BRAUN, "Où en est l'étude du quatrième Evangile?" *ETL* 32 ('56) 535-546.

B sums up briefly the main contributions and general conclusions of the 8th session of the *Journées Bibliques de Louvain*, Sept. 3-5. Johannine studies have entered a period of renewed interest. Bultmann's commentary of 1940 marks the end of an era, while Dodd's work of 1955 has opened up new perspectives of advancement.

In the field of textual criticism, the hypothesis of an Aramaic original would frequently permit a judicious choice among variant readings. This criterion would tend to restore prestige to the Old Latin and Syriac versions and to Tatian's *Diatessaron*. To think the Gospel was written completely in Aramaic would still be excessive.

As for literary criticism, the Gospel is to be treated as an original work, solidly put together, with its roots deep in the primitive Christian oral tradition. Here, especially, Bultmann's work is outmoded. Initial partial redactions would have been put into a more extended composition and would have finally acquired their present form. Though the unity is scarcely contestable, the plan of the Gospel is still open to debate.

The Qumran writings have cast light on the question of the cultural milieu of the Evangelist. It is not certain the author of the Gospel was in direct contact with the Qumran community or knew their writings. It can be affirmed that the background of these writings and the Gospel is the same, and these writings may be used to enlighten the Johannine writings. While linking the Fourth Gospel to the Palestinian background represented by the Qumran community, we must widen our horizon to include certain heterodox Judaic circles like the pre-Christian sect of the Maghâria who could have participated in the same current of piety as the Qumran community.

The Fourth Gospel is to be explained in and by itself and not through preconceived ideas. Some Fathers and many modern critics from Holtzmann to Bultmann have been guilty of this error of method. When Bultmann underlines the distinction between what Jesus is for us and what He is in Himself, he introduces a division foreign to the thought of John.

Dodd declares the question of the author is unimportant and the essential concern is to try to understand the work as it is. This question has not been treated because of the necessary limits of time and program. At the beginning of the century there was question only of the Hellenization of primitive Christianity by John. Today the Palestinian background of the Gospel becomes clearer and clearer. The Mandaean enthusiasm has all but disappeared. As for the date of the Gospel, set by Loisy and others as after 150, several papyrus fragments have upset tons of hypotheses.

The Judaic background of the Gospel does not suppress contacts with Hermetic and Philonian Hellenism. The theological thought of the Evangelist is rooted in history.—V. O'K.

400. S. DE AUSEJO, "Es un Himno a Cristo el Prologo de San Juan?" *EstBib* 15 ('56) 223-277.

This is a preliminary study of John's prologue as a hymn to Christ and establishes a basis for comparison with hymns of the early church and the religious hymns of contemporary literature. Pliny, Justin, Origen, Tertullian, and Eusebius of Caesarea refer to hymns to Christ in the apostolic age. Paul gives us at least six hymns: three are fragments (Eph. 5:14, 1 Tim 1:17, 2 Tim 4:18), another is almost complete (1 Tim 3:16) and two are complete (Phil 2:6-11, Col 1:15-20). The criteria for determining whether a given passage is a hymn are: (1) the theme: a dramatic praise of Christ; (2) the literary form: the division into stanzas according to the fundamental ideas, a literary rhythm due to its expression and elevation, Christ always the subject and the predicates one after another; and (3) a comparison with poetic passages of the OT. The Christological hymns of the early church are considered new poetry for three reasons: (1) The theme praises a new fact in a mental framework adapted to the real historical life of Christ. This coincides in some features with the religious hymns of the environment. (2) An almost uniform rhythm is present and clearly differs from contemporary prose. (3) Hebrew parallelism is absent. If we compare these hymns with those of the OT, there are essential differences both in the disposition of the theme and in the thought. —M. H.

401. J. GIBLET, "La Sainte Trinité selon l'Évangile de saint Jean," *LumVi* 29 ('56) 671-702.

Modern writers often value the Fourth Gospel for its account of what Jesus did, but are not much concerned with its views on what He was. No sharp distinction, however, should be introduced between texts which describe the divine nature of Jesus, and those which pertain to His Messianic activity, for the latter is but a function of the former. This truth is clearly pointed up in the controversy which follows upon Jn 5:17, a text which contains the essentials of the Trinitarian doctrine of the Fourth Gospel: miraculous cures worked on the Sabbath are only the Messianic continuation of the never-ending work of the Father, that of salvation; this work is henceforth to be accomplished by Jesus in accordance with His mission, which itself depends ultimately on His position as eternal Son of the Father. There are, nevertheless, two strongly contrasted aspects to this work of Jesus: (1) He possesses power so extraordinary that it implies divine origin; (2) this same Jesus is utterly dependent even to the point of suffering and death. All difficulty disappears when the two aspects are seen not as contradictory but as complementary. Jesus is a divine being, and at the same time He is in utter conformity with the Father; His will coincides perfectly with the will of the Father, everything in Him being relative to the Father. Thus, His life as man makes evident through human actions the subsistent relation which is His divine reality as Son. The same

pattern emerges in the texts which describe the inter-communications of the Trinity. The Messianic activity of the Son and Holy Spirit presupposes the ontological reality of the Trinity and reveals that reality as involving eternally existing relationships. The Fourth Gospel formulas which express a reciprocity of knowledge, love, and glory between the Father and Jesus are based on and proclaim the eternal procession of the Word from the Father, just as the Holy Spirit's salvific function of revealing the Revealer is based on His position of complete relativity to both Father and Son.—E. R. C.

402. J. GIBLET, "Pour rendre témoignage à la Lumière (John I, 29-34)," *BiViChrét* 16 ('56-'57) 80-86.

The Synoptic Gospels present John the Baptist preaching penance and purifying the Jewish people with water. The Fourth Gospel, for its part, stresses the essential character of the ministry performed by the Baptist: the discovery and the presentation of Him who has come from God to establish the kingdom of the Spirit. The theophany which accompanies the baptism of Jesus reveals to the Baptist the divine glory of the Messiah. John the Baptist can from now on point out the expected Messiah and fulfill his mission, which was to lead to the effusion of the Spirit by the baptism of water. But the Messiah towards whom John the Baptist directs his disciples is not only the dispenser of the Spirit, He truly incarnates the suffering Servant foreseen by Isaiah: He will atone for all sins by the shedding of His blood. The Messiah is in the eyes of John the Baptist "the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world." —P. E. L.

403. L. JACOBS, "Greater Love Hath No Man . . . The Jewish Point of View of Self-Sacrifice," *Judaism** 6 ('57) 41-47.

Modern Jewish teachers have been so nearly unanimous in rejecting this doctrine (Jn 15:13) in the name of Jewish ethic that their repudiation seems not so much the result of careful examination of classic sources as a defence of the ethical distinctions between Judaism and Christianity, (the former based on the concept of justice, the latter on that of love). Hertz correctly states that it would be absurd to expect all men to love others more than themselves, but his denial that Judaism would expect this of any man is disputable. The Bible has a number of relevant passages implying that it is a natural thing, at times, for men to risk their own safety for the sake of others. Rabbinical writings agree in condemning the sacrifice of another's life to save one's own, but do not agree on the question of sacrificing one's own life to save another's. However, the rare individual who can give his life for a friend would be recognized as a saint by Judaism.—J. E. B.

404. P. W. MEYER, "A Note on John 10:1-18," *JBL** 75 ('56) 232-235.

Emphasis on *thura* (door) in vv. 7-9, followed by stress on the shepherd in vv. 10-18 and preceded by seeming stress on shepherd in vv. 1-5, have led most

critics to see a lack of unity in Jn 10:1-18 and, hence, to question the genuinity of vv. 7-9. This is to ignore the fact that *thura* is the critical word in vv. 1-5. Only one using the *door* to the sheepfold rather than one entering *allachotheren* (from another point) is entitled to be called shepherd. Evident reference to the Passion of Christ as a voluntary and vicarious self-sacrifice in vv. 10-18 makes it virtually necessary that *thura* in vv. 1-5 be considered as referring not to the person of Christ but to His death as the means of His passage into the abode of His sheep. Legitimate claim to be shepherd rather than thief rests on legitimate entry—via death. In vv. 7-9 the door by which the true shepherd enters becomes the door which establishes communion of the sheep with the shepherd and, further, the door by which they find sustenance.

The entire passage treats of true and false claims of Messiahship. The claimants are contrasted first in terms of their means of entry ("entering through the door" vs. "ascending from another point"), then in terms of their action in crisis ("laying down one's life" vs. "leaving the sheep and fleeing"). Here is the consistent and unifying thread that runs through the whole passage.—W. F. K.

405. P. PARKER, "Two Editions of John," *JBL** 75 ('56) 303-314.

The breaks in connection and apparent internal contradictions are one of the most tantalizing problems of the Fourth Gospel. Traditional explanations fall under four heads: (1) psychology of the author; (2) use of written sources; (3) textual displacement; (4) a second edition which produced the structural break at Jn 21, during which other additions were made throughout the first draft. Thus a series of parallelisms between 6 and 21 argues strongly to their later composition. Jn 4 was likewise an addition to the Gospel, and most likely 2:1-12. Choice of words suggests that the original author made the revision. Its date is difficult to determine, but seems to be well after 70 A.D. Principal motives for the revision are emphasis on the Eucharist as nourishment and increased stress on the role of Peter.—R. J. B.

406. R. McL. WILSON, "The Fourth Gospel and Hellenistic Thought," *NovT** 1 ('56) 225-227.

Philo's importance as a philosopher who mirrors the thinking and aspirations of NT times by his attempt to interpret the OT in the light of contemporary philosophy should not be underrated. It is another thing altogether, however, to postulate a dependence of the Fourth Gospel on Philo's thought. W. Grosouw, *NovT* 1 ('56) 38, did not make clear that W advanced his opinion to this effect, *ExpT* 65 ('53-'54) 47-49, contrary to the position of A. W. Argyle, *ExpT* 63 ('51-'52) 385-386. Several authors suggest that the Logos of John is more primitive than that of Philo, indeed that it may go back to an earlier form of quasi-Gnostic Jewish thought such as that of the Dead Sea sect. Study of the Essenes may reveal both a common terminology and a fund of ideas available to NT writers and to Philo. Whatever the relation of the gospel to

Jewish influence, it was such as to recommend itself to the Hellenistic world.
—J. F. Br.

CHARACTERS OF THE GOSPELS

407. E. R. CARROLL, "Our Lady's Virginity *post partum*," *MarSt* 7 ('56) 69-102.

The Church's defined doctrine on Mary's virginity *post partum* means that Mary remained a virgin after the birth of Christ, that she had no other children besides Jesus, that she possessed the virtue of perpetual virginity, and that she was immune from concupiscence. This doctrine was not explicitly and officially taught until the Councils of the Lateran (649) and of Constantinople (681). Mary's perpetual virginity was defended, however, much earlier: in the third century by Origen, and in the fourth by Athanasius, by the three Cappadocians, and most especially by Jerome and Ambrose. The theological reasons advanced by these early fathers, and developed by Saint Thomas, centered around her unique dignity as mother of God and her exalted holiness. Following the leadership of Pius XII, modern theologians are delving more and more deeply into the harmony between Mary's perpetual virginity and her other singular prerogatives, especially those of her Immaculate Conception and Assumption.
—R. C.

408. P. EVDOKIMOV, "Jean Baptiste," *BiViChrét* 16 ('56-'57) 7-18.

Here are outlined five aspects which the Bible and icons especially afford us of John the Baptist. (1) As a prophet announcing and initiating the Messianic era, John performs a mysterious mission, fountain of joy and fear. (2) The icons show in the ascetic John "an earthly angel and a heavenly man." They show John and Mary as emanations of Wisdom and as suppliants who appease the Supreme Judge. (3) The Oriental liturgy also brings together John and Mary, "the maternal breast" and the "finger of the Lord," which pave the way for the Incarnation. At once the greatest among the prophets and the smallest of the Messianic kingdom, John introduces both Testaments to the liturgy. (4) This impetuous ascetic who purifies himself in the desert, reduces human cares to essentials and attempts to urge forward the coming of the kingdom; he is an ancestor of the monks, maybe himself an Essenian novice of Qûmran. (5) As head of the Church, John inaugurates the Messianic era; he introduces men to his friend the Bridegroom.—P. E. L.

409. G. G. FOURNELLE, "Our Lady's Marriage to Saint Joseph," *MarSt* 7 ('56) 122-129.

From the marriage prohibitions of the OT, and from the Mishnaic and Talmudic prescriptions concerning marriage, we are able to learn much of the customs that were prevalent at the time of the marriage of Mary and Joseph. The ordinary age of betrothal for a Jewish maiden was 12 years; a period of time elapsed (about a year) between betrothal and the ceremony of entering

the house of the bridegroom; in most respects the couple were legally considered husband and wife; the bride, however, was expected to be a virgin on her wedding night under pain of death; and finally, the marriage contract was completed when the bride entered the house of her husband. In the light of these OT customs, several conclusions can be drawn from the early chapters of Luke and Matthew: Mary was probably about 12 years old when she was betrothed to Joseph; about a year elapsed between her betrothal and her going to live in Joseph's house; she could be called Joseph's wife even during the time of her betrothal; her betrothal was considered a true marriage that could be terminated only by a divorce; and lastly, after the visit of the angel, Joseph took Mary into his house.—R. C.

410. N. KRIEGER, "Ein Mensch in weichen Kleidern," *NovT** 1 ('56) 228-230.

John the Baptist, imprisoned by Herod, sent his disciples to Jesus to ask if He was the one who is to come. Jesus, in His answer, takes the occasion to adumbrate in question form some high points of the Baptist's life (Mt 11:2 ff.). Did the people expect to see a reed shaken by the wind? When Jesus came to John at the Jordan the Baptist was convinced that he had discovered the one to come. Now, shaken in his original conviction, he asks for confirmation. Did the people expect to see a man in soft garments? Such are in the houses of kings. Perhaps this is an allusion to the time when John was in attendance at the court of the tetrarch who is also called a king. It may be that John reproached Herod as he was preparing to leave for Rome to undertake the forbidden marriage with his step-brother's wife, and that John escaped and was protected by the people. Herodias at that time could not take revenge on the Baptist but had her opportunity later when John, after eight years of seclusion in the desert (perhaps in the monastery of Qumran), came forth to preach publicly. The three questions, then, would allude to the following events in the Precursor's life: the "reed" . . . to his present doubt in the prison; the "soft garments" . . . to the rebuke he had administered to Herod some years previously; the "prophet" . . . to John's recent preaching.—J. B. K.

411. M. DE MEULEMEESTER, "Une curieuse controverse au sujet de la virginité perpétuelle de saint Joseph," *Cahiers de Joséphologie* 3 ('55) 29-40.

Since St. Jerome's refutation of the apocryphal gospel of St. James in the *Adversus Helvidium*, no reputable Catholic challenged the virginity of St. Joseph until the 18th century. An obscure Venetian priest, Samuele Falco, reviewed the apocryphal story of a first marriage from which were born the "brothers of Jesus." Whether Falco was influenced by his heterodox friends or by a desire for attention, it is clear that his arguments were not strong. He begs the question by vindicating the force of tradition, and then asserts that tradition is on his side. He uses violent language towards his adversaries, falsifies patristic texts, and makes false claim to ecclesiastical approval. He was answered by a Carmelite priest and later by the Redemptorist Saccardi whose

vindication of St. Joseph's virginity marshals arguments from the Fathers the theologians, and *ex convenientia*. Apart from its prolixity, Saccardi's work is a storehouse of documentation and of erudition.—P. J. R.

412. R. GAUTHIER, "Existence et nature de la paternité de saint Joseph (suite)," *Cahiers de Joséphologie* 3 ('55) 5-28.

This third in a series of articles on the nature of the paternity of St. Joseph treats the interpretations condemned by the Church and then outlines the position of St. Thomas. The condemned propositions are two: first, that Joseph's paternity was physical and purely natural; second, that this paternity, though physical, was miraculous and virginal. The former position, maintained by Carpocrates and other early heretics, by Voltaire, and by some liberal Protestants and Modernists, was condemned by Paul IV in 1555. The latter interpretation, embracing the opinions of Corbato and Petrone, priests, was proposed at the beginning of this century. For Corbato, Christ would not have been a man had not Joseph shared physically in His conception. The fecundation, however, miraculously effected by the Holy Ghost, preserved the virginity of the parents. For Petrone, what must be vindicated is Joseph's part in the hypostatic union. P insists that the semen of Joseph play an instrumental role in the divine conception, so that Joseph does not become, as Corbato had held, the true father, but merely an instrument. Garrigou-Lagrange said Petrone's distinction is meaningless, since the proper effect of semen was passive generation; hence it cannot be called an instrumental effect. Both opinions were condemned by the Holy Office which cited the constant teaching of the Fathers that Jesus was not born *ex semine Joseph*. Corbato's distinction between semen and germen is a subtlety foreign to the language of the Church and therefore not admissible.

St. Thomas teaches traditional Catholic thought: the Holy Spirit brought about the conception of Christ, and without use of any male semen. This must be admitted or other evidently absurd hypotheses will have to be accepted. Therefore, there is nothing carnal in Joseph's paternity, and in this sense he is the "putative" father of Christ.—P. J. R.

413. F. SPADAFORA, "Studi su Maria SS," *Palestra del Clero* 35 ('56) 1113-24.

Discusses four articles in *Bible et vie chrétienne* 7 ('54) and some recent lives of Mary.—J. J. C.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

414. J. DUPLACY, "A propos d'une variante 'occidentale' des *Actes des Apôtres* (III, 11)," *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 2 ('56) 231-242.

The transmission of the text of Sacred Scripture took place in concrete circumstances of time and place. Therefore, history and archaeology can sometimes help in deciding between two textual variants. Acts 3:11 is a case in point. The Beza Codex and the Fleury Palimpsest describe the lame beggar who had just been cured as accompanying Peter and John out of the Temple

to the Porch of Solomon, where Peter then addressed the crowd that had gathered. None of the other manuscripts mentions this egress from the Temple. The Occidental variant, however, though vouched for by so few witnesses, is textually as ancient as the more common Oriental text of this verse; both can be traced back to the second century. From archaeology and history it is clear that the Porch of Solomon was outside the wall surrounding the Court of the Women, which was the limit of the Temple area proper, the *hieron* in the strict sense of the term. Hence, the Occidental variant is in positive agreement with the archaeological facts; it must have been written down by someone who knew the Temple before its total destruction in 70 A.D. The Oriental variant, on the contrary, implies that the Porch of Solomon was within the *hieron*, thus forcing us to take the term in its less proper sense as including the Court of the Gentiles. On the assumption that the Occidental variant is the original, the Oriental text can be explained as an attempt to harmonize this verse with Jn 10:23. On the opposite assumption, however, the Occidental variant is inexplicable. It represents, therefore, the original text, in all probability.—W. F. M.

415. J. E. MÉNARD, "*Pais Theou* as Messianic Title in the Book of Acts," *CBQ* 19 ('57) 83-92.

Is the title *pais theou* attributed to Jesus in Acts an original interpretation used only by the first community of Jerusalem? No such reference is made to Christ in the Synoptics. The trend of Jewish apocalyptic thought expected a glorious Messiah which ruled out the Suffering Messiah of Is 53. The Jews also strongly believed that Elias or one of the great prophets would return first, as a herald of the Messiah, but that he would be a prophet ready to suffer and die for his people. The Synoptics interpreted Christ's life and Passion according to this Jewish apocalyptic thought: Jesus the Prophet suffering and dying for His people, not the Suffering Servant of Is 53. But how did the early Christians reconcile Christ's death with their belief that He was the Messiah? The new kerygma of Acts (outlined in Lk 24:25-27, 44-46) sees Christ fulfilling both Dt 18:15 and Is 53. Compelled to trace back Christ's death in the Scriptures, the early Christians found a *de facto* relation between the suffering Son of Man and the Suffering Servant. Thus by the time of the Acts *pais theou* has become a Messianic title; Christ was not merely considered the dying Prophet, but the suffering and dying Messiah.—J. F. B.

416. M. WILCOX, "The Old Testament in Acts 1-15," *AusBR* 5 ('56) 1-41.

It is often stated that the source of OT quotations and allusions in Acts is the LXX. But close investigation of Acts 1-15 reveals the presence of a different OT text. A group of instances can be produced where the text cited in Acts differs from the LXX, but is in keeping with other authorities either Hebrew, Greek, or Aramaic. The following texts, studied in detail, show affinity to Aramaic and Samaritan sources: 13:22; 13:11; 7:3; 7:5; 7:10b;

7:4; 7:32. Two (7:16; 8:32) show affinity to the MT. Further, three citations, each occurring twice in Acts, and in almost identical form, point to a non-LXX Greek source (3:22 and 7:37; 3:13 and 7:32; 5:30 and 10:39b). It does not follow that Luke made immediate use of Hebrew or Aramaic texts; he used rather ready-made Greek source-material derived from these. This Greek source could stem from the *ipsissima verba* of the speakers in Acts, who could have employed traditions current in the Jewish and Samaritan circles of their day.—W. J. D.

EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL

417. E. BEST, "The Body of Christ," *Ecumenical Review** 9 ('57) 122-128.

To understand St. Paul's meaning of the term "body of Christ" it is necessary to study its use against the background of the totality of Pauline theology. It is apparent from his use of many other figures, that he never intended this single figure as his definitive description of the Church. For instance, he says believers are "in Christ"; they and Christ form a building of which He is the chief cornerstone (Eph 2:20) and the foundation (1 Cor 3:11) and the building is in Him (Eph 2:21) and He dwells in it (1 Cor 2:16). As it would be a mistake to deny in these figures the metaphorical content or the basic reality they describe, so a too literal or too figurative interpretation of the term "body of Christ" would be erroneous.

Paul uses the word "body" to connote the whole man. The main weight of the phrase does not lie in the physical visibility of the body, but in the inwardness of life which flows between Christ and His believers and from one believer to another. In no way, however, is he describing an invisible, ideal group, for he applies the term readily in 1 Cor to the visible, existing Church.

The variety of his uses of the phrase excludes the possibility that he wished by it to express an ontological relationship wholly excluding metaphor. In 1 Cor 12:21 the head is simply a member of the body, while in Col and Eph the head is the supreme member, Jesus Christ. Such a strictly ontological interpretation would lead to the deceptive and un-Pauline description of the Church as the continuation of the Incarnation. The Incarnation was completed with the death of Christ and cannot be repeated. The Church can be the messenger of the reconciliation accomplished by Christ but it cannot achieve reconciliation. For the external mission of the Church and of believers, Paul prefers more personalized figures, as: "In Christ the Christian labours (1 Cor 15:58). In Christ he stands firm (Phil 4:1) and is strong (Eph 6:10)." These figures would emphasize the personal responsibility of each individual in the Church more thoroughly than would the more universal description, "body of Christ."

Paul uses "body of Christ" to denote a real relationship between Christ and His believers and between the believers themselves, a relationship of the dependent body to the Supreme Head who at once activates, nourishes, and rules the members, a "body" whose members enjoy diverse activities but are firmly united.—T. M. C.

418. W. J. P. BOYD, "1 Corinthians ii. 8," *ExpT** 68 ('57) 158.

The phrase "the rulers of this world," treated by T. Ling in *ExpT** 68 ('56) 26, must be considered according to Paul's advanced demonology, and consequently must refer to both the human powers and the created, hostile spirit powers behind them; the visible manifests the invisible. The text is congruous with Col 2:15 and Acts 3:17, 3:27. According to Col 2:15 the spirit powers did not know the results of the Crucifixion; otherwise it would follow that sinful men alone would be the cause of it, for they would be rejecting the offer of God in Christ and at the same time resisting the efforts of the evil spirits aimed at preventing their own downfall in the cross.—T. A. J.

419. C. DUQUOC, "Le dessein salvifique et la révélation de la Trinité en saint Paul," *LumVi* 29 ('56) 643-670.

D challenges the conclusion reached in Cullmann's book, *Les premières confessions de foi chrétiennes*, namely, that a shift of emphasis from Christ to the Trinity took place in the early Church due to the external circumstances of heresy and of pagan and Jewish opposition. It appears that Cullmann has placed too much isolated importance on these formal "confessions of faith." An attempt to equate every "tripartite formula" with belief in the Trinity might be mistaken for oversimplification. The context of various Pauline expressions, however, indicates a triple diversity of function in God's unique act of revelation and redemption. The "three divine actors" who perform these functions, Father, Son, and Spirit, cannot be interpreted as three attributes of the One God. An analysis of their roles and names leads to the predication of distinct personalities. Thus St. Paul clearly understood the essential position of the Trinity at the core of Christ's revelation.—J. E. O'C.

420. S. LYONNET, "De doctrina praedestinationis et reprobationis in Rom 9," *VD* 34-35 ('56) 193-201 & 257-271.

Since the time of Augustine, passages in Rom 9 have been used as scriptural proof for various theories on predestination and reprobation. Was St. Paul really concerned with those problems in Rom 9? (1) Mal 1:2, quoted in Rom 9:13: "Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated." It is not enough to say that 'hated' means 'loved less'—Mal explains the hatred as positive punishment; nor are God's love and hatred to be understood *post praevisa merita*—Paul quotes Mal to show that election does *not* depend on man's merits. L maintains that Mal is not concerned with the eternal salvation or reprobation of the individuals Jacob and Esau, but with the fate in this world of their respective posterities. (2) The hardening of Pharaoh's heart. Against Calvin, L explains: *exêgeira* does not mean 'I brought into existence' but 'I raised up for a definite historical task' (cf. Mt 24:11). There is no question here of the final damnation of Pharaoh's soul. By hardening his heart at a certain time God used him as his instrument in working out the salvation of the human race. (3) The parable of the potter. The same parable is used in 2 Tm 2:20-21, where the vessels of

clay are false teachers, of whose final salvation Paul does not despair. The vessels of wrath, *katêrtismena eis apôleian*, are not, as Calvin thought, 'disposed by God for damnation'—the verb can very well be middle: they have disposed themselves. By delaying to punish Israel for the sins by which it has disposed itself for destruction, God is able to display not only His anger but also His patience and longanimity—allowing Israel time for conversions (Rom 9:22); v. 22 adds that Israel's present infidelity is ordered also to the conversion of the Gentiles (cf. Acts 13:46 etc.). In this way Paul justifies the ways of God in this world—but without pronouncing upon the problem of eternal predestination and reprobation as placed by theologians.—J. F. Bl.

421. C. SPICQ, "Comment comprendre *φιλεῖν* dans I Cor. xvi, 22?" *NovT** 1 ('56) 200-204.

The verse usually translated, "If anyone does not love the Lord, let him be anathema," does not contain a curse, but in a liturgical formula describes the state of a person who rejects Christ the Lord. This interpretation is based on an examination of *philein* and *Kyrios*. *Philein* (tender affection) occurs but twice in Paul, and only here (1 Cor 16:22) in a religious formula; hence *philein* is here equivalent to *agapan* (to adore, venerate) and the verse is apparently a quotation of an ancient Aramaic liturgical formula. *Kyrios* (Lord), a title of Syro-Hellenistic kings, was applied by the Christians to Jesus to signify His sovereign authority over them. At Corinth, Paul checked a satanically inspired blasphemy with a familiar formula: "Whoever curses Jesus, will be cursed by Him." Hence, anyone who "does not love the Lord," rejects Him, refuses to belong to Him, and is excluded from the Church, the Eucharist, and the heavenly kingdom. The statement may seem tautological since legal but ritual texts often assert the obvious.—J. T. B.

422. D. E. H. WHITELEY, "Expository Problems: Ephesians VI:12—Evil Powers," *ExpT** 68 ('57) 100-103.

The demonic, as "vitality acting chaotically and destructively," is certainly actual, though perhaps this actuality need not be ascribed to personal entities nor even granted objective existence. The influence of these demonic powers, against which Ephesians gives warning, can be seen in current history: e.g., in the vital, supra-individual forces that led to the last war. The secularist recognizes that we are "in the grip of circumstances." On the moral level, we must assert that man is in no way determined by such circumstances or demonic forces. But the precise and kernel point of NT teaching concerning these evil powers is that Christ was victorious over them and that we can share in His victory.

Exegetically, we need not pin down 'principality,' 'power,' and the other items of this text. The enumeration is merely for rhetorical mass-effect. But what about contemporary applications of this sense of 'the demonic'? Situations in which emotions normally cohesive become destructive may be called demonic

—as in the breakdown of conjugal and family relationships or of any human society. Tillich saw the demonic in nationalism and in the autonomy of the economic. It exists in industry, on both sides of labor-management. It exists in the conflicts of group loyalties. Why term these strong, vital forces demonic? Their purpose is to express our present troubles in the language of the NT, to see the bearing of its message on the problems of our life. Because Christ is one with God, and because we are members of Christ, the whole power of God is behind us in our struggle with the evil powers.—R. L. R.

CATHOLIC EPISTLES, APOCALYPSE

423. M.-E. BOISMARD, "Je renonce à Satan, à ses pompes et à ses oeuvres," *LumVi* 26 ('56) 105-110.

All the baptismal liturgies of the third and fourth centuries contain a renunciation of Satan. There is a great variety, however, in the number, kind, and order of the other renunciations connected with the first. Specifically, the works, pomp, angels, and cult of Satan are renounced in the different liturgies. In Hebrew, all these words come from the same root, *l'k*, to send. Considering that Hebrew was in all probability the liturgical language first used by the Christian community of Jerusalem, it seems likely that the different formulae of renunciation all derive from an original Hebrew formula of two terms. A direct echo of the Jerusalem baptismal liturgy is to be found in 1 Pet 1:13-2:10, and it indicates that a typology of baptism based on Ex 5:3 ff. was expressed. The people of God were to be released from the works of slavery imposed by Pharaoh so that they could go out into the desert and offer sacrifice to Yahweh. The Christian life is regarded as a cult offered to God. Thus, the believer by baptism is released from the slavery of works imposed by Satan, that is, from his cult, and is consecrated to the works and cult of God. Consequently, the original formula contained a renunciation of Satan and his works understood as a cult. When the formula was translated into Greek, however, some misread the unvowelled Hebrew text and rendered "his works" as "his angels" or "his mission (*pompē*)."—W. F. M.

424. A. COLUNGA, "El Milenio (Apoc. XX, 1-6)," *Salmanticensis* 3 ('56) 220-227.

The Apocalypse must be interpreted according to (1) the general purpose of the book (to narrate the battle between the serpent and the woman's descendants until the latter's victory) and (2) the method of the OT prophets (who first emphasized the justice of God and then His mercy).

In Ap 20:1-6, after Christ's enemies die at Armageddon (only the dragon, bound and imprisoned, survives) there follows the peaceful reign of Christ and His saints on earth for a thousand years. Thus St. John first describes a series of battles and then, like the prophets, the peace of God. Such is the work of God: punishment to the third and fourth generation, and blessings to the

thousandth (Ex 34:6). This interpretation obviates millenarism. In the history of the Church there were three centuries of persecution and then sixteen centuries of peace. Persecutions have continued, but the biblical style is idealistic in describing the Messianic era. The Fathers equated the idol cults with devil worship; hence, the defeat of Roman paganism was a great victory over the devil. Finally in Christ's reign, the faithful may enjoy His graces and peace even in persecution. It is clear that the thousand years must not be taken literally; the prophets speak about peace indefinitely. Days of greater persecution will come at the end as Christ and St. Paul indicate (Mt 24:22; 2 Thes 2:3 ff.).—J. B. C.

425. I. FRANSEN, "Cahier de Bible: Jésus, le Témoin fidèle (Apocalypse)," *BiViChrét* 16 ('56-'57) 66-79.

Part I: Introduction: (1) The Apocalypse is textured with OT quotations. The images and the themes of the OT thus give the key to the book. (2) The Apocalypse springs from the prophetic and apocalyptic literary genre. To sustain the courage of the early Christians under trial, the inspired author describes the celestial liturgy which glorifies Christ. He reveals also the end of the world in a language composed of borrowings from astrology and popular mythology; paraphrases or borrowed words conceal the challenging forces. The future is seen through the present and judged in relation to it. (3) The composition of the work shows a tortuous path which conveys the sensation of disorder, and which in fact brings the reader to a summit from which can be discovered the whole landscape patiently sketched by the writer. (4) The Apocalypse has for its aim to protect the Christian communities of Asia Minor against Jewish influences. To this end, John recalls a number of important truths: the irreducible opposition between the world and the Christian, the necessity of persecution which leads to glory. He also describes the persistent struggle in which the Church engages against the Antichrist, and certain aspects of the parousia. Part II: The Préparation du Texte outlines a detailed plan of the whole Apocalypse. It occasionally reconstitutes the historical and cultural context of the work; it analyzes the meaning of the figures employed, indicates the literary procedures, points out the more suggestive scriptural allusions, and brings up questions which put one on the road to personal research.—P. E. L.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

426. H. BACHT, "Einfalt des Herzens—eine vergessene Tugend?" *Geist und Leben* 29 ('56) 416-426.

Simplicity of heart, so important in NT and sub-apostolic spirituality, is a forgotten virtue today. An examination of pertinent biblical passages will aid in grasping its significance. Gn 6:9 calls Noah a perfect man, using the word often rendered by LXX and the Vulgate as "simple" (*tamín*). Here, and in Gn 17:1, regarding Abraham, the idea of perfection is connected with the observance of the covenant. From Gn 20:5 and 1 Kgs 9:4, it is clear that simpli-

city also connotes good faith and a good intention. In 1 Chr 29:17, simplicity of heart refers to perfect fulfillment of the law with an open, undivided heart. The Psalter renders the Hebrew root in various ways but always with the connotation of wholeness, entirety, in the gift of self to God. Therefore, the Hebrew word has an amazing richness: to be simple means to walk in the way that leads to God, to be unswervingly loyal to God's covenant, to be wholehearted in giving oneself to God. Such a man's heart is simple because it is undivided, and a man who acts thus is perfect, just, or righteous.

Therefore, in Eph 6:5 and Col 3:22, simplicity of heart means wholeheartedness, giving oneself entirely to the service of one's master. The "simplicity which is in Christ" of 2 Cor 11:3 is complete loyalty to Christ. To give in simplicity, according to 2 Cor 8-9, means to give from one's whole heart, and in this sense to be generous; it is not the amount given that manifests generosity but the spirit in which it is given. Thus, God's giving is simple, i.e., without reserve, complete, as opposed to human giving which generally involves a hope of some return being made for the gift. The simple eye of Mt 6:22 (where the eye is an expression of the soul) means absolute totality in the gift of self to God. If this is true of a man, the whole man is in order. The same idea lies behind Mt 6:21 (serving two masters) and in our Lord's condemnation of Pharisaic hypocrisy in Lk 11:37-54, and even in the great commandment (Lk 10:27): to love with thy whole soul, etc. The simple eye, simplicity of heart, and the childlike spirit are all the same: complete, undivided gift of self to God.—I. J. M.

427. H. BACHT, "Tradition als menschliches und theologisches Problem," *SDZ* 159 ('56-'57) 285-300.

The first part of this article treats tradition as a human problem. The positive value of tradition has been more evident since the second World War. Tradition is a vital thing that can be used as a norm for present and future conduct.

The main body of the article deals with tradition as a theological problem. Protestant theologians such as K. Skydsgaard and R. Bultmann assert that never since the days of the Reformation has the attention of Protestant theology been focused on the concept of tradition as it is today. Most Protestant theologians, however, including Bultmann himself, do not accept the Catholic concept of tradition as a source of revelation. The Catholic concept of tradition is clearly presented in the Council of Trent, but the Council did not state the precise meaning of "and" in the phrase: ". . . in written books and unwritten tradition." Another unsolved problem is the exact role of the Magisterium in transmitting the apostolic heritage. To the Tübingen school, especially J. A. Möhler, must go the credit for giving a new impulse to the Catholic understanding of tradition. The role of the Magisterium, partially treated by Möhler, was stressed by Franzelin and Scheeben. In replying to the objections of the Reformers, that the Magisterium assumes a position superior to that of Scripture, Franzelin replies that the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, has

the duty to interpret Scripture and to distinguish the true word of God from the false. Scripture, Tradition, and the Church cannot be separated, for it is the same Spirit at work in all three, though in different ways.—N. F. D.

428. R. BELLEMARE, "Pour une théologie thomiste de la pauvreté," *RUO* 26 ('56) 137-164.

An attempt has been made to delineate the ideas of St. Thomas on poverty. The importance of the problem of poverty in the modern world and the place which poverty holds in the Gospels deserves such special consideration. In St. Thomas is found the distinction of objective and subjective poverty. St. Thomas points out that one can be poor and not have the intentions of Christ. In the Gospels are found texts which refer to the poverty of spirit of the beatitudes and those which refer to a state of life. Thomas makes no effort to reconcile the two, but handles them separately. Mt 5:3 is not found once in the 2^a-2^{ae}. Thomas also discusses the relation between poverty and the fear of God. He points out that poverty suppresses an obstacle to the pursuit of true happiness. There is a fear of worldly goods since they can rob us of spiritual beatitude. In this sense fear causes poverty.

In an appendix B traces Thomas' treatment of the possessions of religious in his *Contra Repugnantes*, *Contra Retrahentes*, *Summa Contra Gentiles* and *Summa Theologica*. Thomas gradually realized that religious poverty is more perfect according to the privation which best serves the end of each institute. This article should be of interest to those desirous of constructing a moral theology on St. Thomas.—A. J. J.

429. BISHOP CASSIAN, "The Family of God," *Ecumenical Review** 9 ('57) 129-142.

Gospel evidence traces the existence of the Church to the very origins of our faith. Here we find several images emphasizing the organic unity of the Church: the "Israel of God," the bride, the marriage between Christ and His Church, the building image, and, most important of all, the image of the Church as the body of Christ. But the Church is also the house, household, family of God. The first element in this concept of the Church as the family of God is the fatherhood of God. This is stressed by Matthew and Mark, less so by Luke. It is also emphasized in Paul, whose thought is by no means exclusively Christocentric (as opposed to theocentric), and finally in John. If God is our Father, we are His sons, His children. We are "adoptive" sons, yes, but we should not be too quick to renounce *our* divine sonship. This fatherhood of God and our sonship involves necessarily the brotherhood of men. A third element in the same image is the idea of salvation conceived as God's *adoption* of the faithful. Adoption in the sense of acquired sonship, of mystical union with and in Christ, is the high point in NT soteriology. This teaching applies to the concept of the Church as the family of God. Although this image is not stressed so much

as that of the body of Christ, still, as it is connected with the culminating point of biblical soteriology, it is ultimately more important. It enables us to penetrate more profoundly in the mystery of the Church, and, as an image, it is more comprehensive. It is significant for the ecumenical dialogue that baptism is the sacrament of our adoption, alone capable of achieving it. Moreover, baptism is mutually recognized among Christians, and is not repeated when one passes from one confession to another. Finally, the image includes the slaves. Today's "slaves" are those who do not recognize Christ—Jews, Mohammedans, pagans—and who are members of God's family only in the limited sense of the ancient slave.—R. L. R.

430. H. CUNLIFFE-JONES, "Serious Encounter," *Interpretation** 10 ('56) 411-419.

In the past the systematic theologian has been certain that the Bible was his book and that he knew how to use it. In modern times tension has developed between systematic theologians and biblical scholars. The theologian must apply the truths of Christian revelation to the contemporary world. He draws his understanding of Christian revelation from the Bible. Modern biblical criticism has made older theological interpretations untrustworthy. Hence for many years theologians have abandoned the detailed treatment of the Bible and have treated only general biblical themes. Biblical scholars have moved from details of criticism toward biblical theology. They must realize the limits of their field and leave to the theologians the application of biblical truths to the modern world. The theologian on his part must learn from the research of biblical scholars. His theological affirmations must reflect the absorption of their permanent achievements. The relation of the theologian to the biblical scholar must be one of continuous dependence combined with real freedom of judgment. It is important for each side to recognize the contributions and the limitations of his science. The theologian finds the Bible normative both for setting forth the basic elements of Christian truth and for framing a contemporary philosophy of human existence.—J. T. D.

431. V. DE COUESNONGLE, "Du nouveau en théologie morale? *La Loi du Christ* du Père Häring," *LumVi* 30 ('56) 852-859.

In this article, C reviews a new approach to Moral Theology which attempts to reorientate morality upon the basis of "*réponse-responsabilité*" to the call of Christ, rather than upon the traditional plan of former manuals which "seem to have no other purpose than to learn to come as close as possible to sin without committing it." Although C has great praise for the aim of the new approach and for the treatment of much of the matter, he feels that Häring's book is not adequate as a manual for seminarians. However, he recommends it highly as a book of spirituality, suited for priests and for educated laymen.—J. E. O'C.

432. V. DELLAGIACOMA, "Fragmenta Porphyrii super N.T.," *VD* 34 ('56) 211-216.

The fifteen books of Porphyry's *Adversus Christianos* (ca. 270 A.D.) have perished, but a number of fragments have been preserved, chiefly in the works of Macarius Manetes. The selections here presented give an idea of the bitter, worldly-wise, jeering, sometimes blasphemous tone of P's attacks upon Christ our Lord, St. Peter and St. Paul. Occasionally P throws a valuable sidelight on the truth, e.g., when he alludes to the world-wide diffusion of Christianity in his own day, or when he shows how well he understood that in Mt 16:18 St. Peter, the *coryphaeus et primus discipulorum* and *claviger regni*, is appointed *portare fundamentum Ecclesiae*.—J. F. Bl.

433. J. DUPLACY, "La révélation de la Trinité dans une impasse: Le Judéo-Christianisme," *LumVi* 29 ('56) 703-718.

Judaism as a whole refused to accept even the possibility that Jesus could be God. There existed a religious milieu, however, where the Jewish monotheistic faith held a certain belief in Jesus without attaining its full dimension: Judaeo-Christianity.

Heretical Judaeo-Christianity had the following theology. While preserving the same faith in the one God as did the main Church, it differed in its belief regarding the Son of God. Jesus is the Master. He is the Lord, "our Lord"; but this title does not bear the strong meaning which is found in the primitive Christian vocabulary. Judaeo-Christianity does not ignore the chief reflections of the Synoptics on the unique relations of the Father and the Son. But if the Judaeo-Christians eventually employ the same language as the main Church, they do not attribute the same meaning to it. To them the Son of God is not God, and that is the essential point. If He is the Son of God, it is by election. Judaeo-Christian Christology is adoptianistic. This divine adoption took place at Jesus' baptism. Furthermore, Christ's mission was essentially to instruct, and therefore they considered Him no greater than a prophet.

While the divinity of Jesus was at least a problem resolved in the negative, that of the Holy Ghost is not even a problem. Judaeo-Christianity may well speak of the Holy Spirit of God, and even with formulas which grant Him a sort of personality. The prophetic Spirit could well reside in Jesus, for the Spirit can be in man. These affirmations do not surpass those of the OT or of Judaism. Unorthodox Judaeo-Christian theology became fixed or regressed to a stage prior to the Trinitarian revelation of the NT. It settled on a few primitive Christological formulas or titles, depriving itself of the light contained in the others. The terms retained finally became divested of their primitive meaning and were ready to be integrated with concepts that have no connection with Christianity.—J. G. C.

434. M. GIRAUDO, "Il Vangelo e la Chiesa" *SacDoc* ('56) 213-218.

The question of how and when Jesus instituted His Church deserves our attention. No living organism, either in the physical, social, moral, or spiritual

world, develops in a moment. It has to pass through different stages of evolution. Is the Church subject to evolution? The answer will vary according to our point of view. From the standpoint of Christ there was no evolution. In Him the lineaments of His Church were perfect from the beginning. But from the standpoint of its concrete actualization, we must say that the Church is subject to evolution, or better, to the progress of man and of time. About this last point we can consider the concrete realization of the Church during the life of Christ or in the life of the Mystical Body. We limit ourselves to the lifetime of Christ and see in it three phases in the institution of His Church: the preparation, the realization, and the promulgation. The preparation includes the whole life of Christ up to the moment just before His death. During this time we see Christ laying down the constitutive elements of His Church: the revelation of the great mysteries and the morality of the new law and the sacraments. The second phase is accomplished with the death of Christ on the Cross. On Calvary the elements of the first phase acquired their own true value, for it was on the Cross that they had their effective origin. The third phase embraces the actions of the risen Christ, the power of forgiving sins granted to the apostles, the effective power in the Church given to Peter, and the commission to evangelize the world after the descent of the Holy Spirit. From that time on, the history of the Church is but an uninterrupted series of suggestions from the Holy Spirit and a continuous remembrance on the part of the Church of the teaching of Jesus.—F. A.

435. G. HEBERT, "Hope Looking Forward," *Interpretation** 10 ('56) 259-269.

How far does the OT anticipate the Christian hope of the life of the world to come? A difficulty arises from the fact that NT writers frequently did not give exact references when they spoke of the fulfillment of the Scriptures. Nevertheless, the NT writers followed certain lines in developing OT prophecies about the resurrection. The principal are these: (1) The purpose of God is seen as being worked out, by God's marvelous action, in situations where human resources are at an end. (2) The Lord's work of salvation is to be accomplished through suffering. (3) The deliverance of Israel from Egypt is the basis of Israel's existence as the people of God; the future deliverance, when God will accomplish His purpose of salvation, is seen by the prophets as a second Exodus. The difference between the OT and NT ideas of a life after death is that the OT belief is based on hope alone, whereas in the NT this hope becomes a sure confidence bound up with the actuality of the redemption. Thus the OT points to the Easter faith, but only as hope looking forward into the future. The NT alone proclaims that the Promised One has come.—R. J. B.

436. H. HOLSTEIN, "Au temps du modernisme," *Etudes* 291 ('56) 212-233.

Until the foundation of *Recherches de science religieuse* in 1910, *Etudes* was an ecclesiastical review. The latter's articles on the crisis of Modernism are

many and provide ample reflection on the course of the controversy. It is *Etudes'* glory that it never deviated from the search for truth, even though, in their sincere desire for objectivity, men like Brucker and Méchineau tended to be more conservative than men like Prat and de Grandmaison.

Etudes saw Modernism coming and tried to extract what was good from it, to correct its errors and to keep personalities out of the battle. H provides a table of the principal events in the crisis and cites numerous articles from *Etudes* illustrating the reaction of its editors. H thanks Modernism for causing the new interest in scholarship which, he feels, makes the possibility of a new Modernism very remote.—P. J. R.

437. J. HUHN, "Das Marienbild in den Schriften des Hrabanus Maurus," *Scholastik* 31 ('56) 515-532.

Maurus, along with the Fathers, clearly affirms the maternity of Mary, and he also asserts that Mary is the Mother of God (*Theotokos*). He sees the necessity of Mary's virginity in the sinlessness of Christ. In the light of salvific history, he makes a comparison between Eve and Mary, the one bringing guilt, the other salvation into the world. Since in the Incarnation Christ unites Himself with human nature and the Church, so the womb of Mary is the bridal chamber of the unity. From an investigation into the writings of Hrabanus Maurus, we can conclude that his works follow closely the teachings of the Fathers. In his defense and propagation of Marian doctrine, he shows himself a good witness and representative of Catholic faith.—N. F. D.

438. P. JORDAN, "Israels Glaube in christlicher Sicht," *BenMon* 32 ('56) 373-381.

The appearance of the new German Catechism of Unity gives rise to a discussion about the use of the OT and NT in catechesis and biblical instruction. It is erroneous to conceive Judaism as a religion merely of the Law. The prophets constantly affirm that the Jewish people are a chosen people only in so far as they are holy; a purification of the heart is required and not solely a legalistic religion. In bridging the gap between the OT and the NT there are common as well as diversifying elements: a common faith in one God, the common requirement of love of God and neighbor, etc. A divergence is clearly visible, however, in the notion of original sin and the consequences that flow from it, which Judaism does not recognize. The basic tenets of Judaic dogma include: (1) the existence of God, (2) revelation, (3) reward and punishment. For the Jews, however, dogmatic investigation holds a secondary place because questions of eternity belong to the mysteries of God. In Jewish moral teaching the three theological virtues hold the leading position, but of the three faith is uppermost. The two chief Commandments of Mt 22:37 ff. are the essence of all religious life for the Christian as well as the Jew.

In a better understanding of the OT and its relation to the NT, much mis-

understanding would be averted, prejudice would be set aside, and the Christian revelation would shine forth even more brilliantly. The fate of all humanity is mirrored in the fate of Israel. The understanding of this is the key to understanding the entire history of salvation.—N. F. D.

439. S. LYONNET, "L'originalité du message chrétien. A propos du *Theologisches Wörterbuch*," *Biblica* 37 ('56) 477-487.

Despite the death of its founder, Gerhard Kittel, this important work continues publication under the direction of Gerhard Friedrich. Volume 5 appeared in 1954, and, with fascicles of Volume 6 appearing, the end of the work is in sight. Friedrich retained, and even improved, the policy of open-mindedness in treating Catholic opinion. Among the collaborators are two Catholic exegetes. The articles themselves show a greater unity in Volume 5 than in the earlier volumes, since the topics are now assigned to individuals rather than to groups. More thorough treatment, too, is given the notional import of words as opposed to the merely verbal. Best of all, however, is the marked increase in accentuating the originality of the NT against the tendency to discover in it the influences of Hellenism and Gnosticism. Prominent in this respect are the articles on *xenos*, *onoma*, *oikos*, *paradeisos*, *parousia*. The only article which does not seem to follow this pattern is that of H. Seesemann on *oida*. This reaction against seeing Gnostic and Hellenistic influences in the NT is of great importance to exegesis, especially with reference to the sayings of our Lord. There is of course a value, especially apologetic, in comparing the usage of the NT with the vocabulary of the Greek and OT worlds; but, as the article *xenos* clearly shows, a superficial identification of terms would serve only to present a part of the meaning of the NT.—R. L. T.

440. C. F. D. MOULE, "The Biblical Conception of 'Faith'," *ExpT** 68 ('57) 157.

The meaning of the word *pistis* in the NT does not refer primarily to God's or Christ's faithfulness as T. F. Torrance wrote in *ExpT** 68 ('57) 111, because in an expression like *pistis Christou Iesou* the loose genitive may be objective rather than subjective; the verb *pisteuo* sometimes has Christ as its object; the noun *pistis* sometimes clearly refers to the believer's faith; and finally, the proposed interpretation slights man's cooperation in responding to God's approach.—T. A. J.

441. H. MUSURILLO, "The Development of Early Christian Ethics," *Thought* 31 ('56) 385-402.

In reply to certain modern non-Catholic ethical theories, M attempts to survey the development of early ethical thought from apostolic times down to the Peace of the Church. In the NT, the chief sources of morality are the conscience and prophetic prescription. As the Jews of the Old Law had always been

directed by a body of halachic truth, so the Christians received their moral guidance from authorized apostles and prophets in the primitive kerygma. In Paul, however, besides the appeal to prophetic prescription there is introduced the element of the "works of the flesh" which are "unsuitable" for man as such; and it is this Pauline list of "natural" prohibitions which is lengthened in, for example, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, as a reflection of the moral reform movement which was developing in the early second century. By the time of Clement and the Alexandrian school, under the influence of Stoic thought, this tendency develops into a reasoned ethic. The use of an allegorical or symbolic presentation of the moral dilemma as Two Ways first clearly occurs in Barnabas and the *Didache*, and reflects the imagery found in the Qumrân scrolls. The rest of the article attempts to show how the Fathers used elements of Stoic, Platonic and Aristotelian moral theory to illustrate the fundamental ethics of the NT kerygma.—H. Ms.

442. J. R. NELSON, "Many Images of The One Church," *Ecumenical Review** 9 ('57) 105-113.

The recent resurgence of study of the church images in the Bible is of great value to the ecumenical theologian in spite of the dangers inherent in the careless use of these figurative terms. Agreement on the incorporation and use of such terms as the body of Christ, the royal priesthood, and the bride of Christ, without concord on their precise meaning for the various denominations, can be a deceptive and false accord. While it is true that many of the various images are distinct and enjoy certain priority of importance over others, too rigorous an insistence on the importance of one over any or all of the others is a misconstruing of the intention of the biblical writers and is divisive thinking. For, while we must agree with J. A. T. Robinson that, at least for St. Paul, the concept of the body forms the keystone of theology, we must recognize that even this beautiful image of the body of Christ must be supplemented by the insights which are communicated by the vine, the temple, the kingdom, and others.

Although the correct use of these images contributes much to our growing knowledge of the nature of the Church, we must remember that the person and work of Christ are assumed to be central and determinative for the life of the Church. Observe, for instance, how the living stones of the building, the flock of sheep, the brethren and heirs of the household, the fruitful branches of the vine, the one communion loaf, etc., supplement the single explicit reference to the unified Church in Jn 17:21; or how the sower in the field, the flourishing vine, and the olive shoots grafted into the trunk of the tree enrich and explain the traditional teachings concerning the mission of the Church. The writers of the Bible offered us these images as explanations and pictures of the reality and mystery of the Church "for our learning and direction, so that in all ways we of the many churches may fulfill the calling of God."—T. M. C.

443. H. B. PORTER, JR., "The Eucharistic Piety of Justin Martyr," *AnglTR** 39 ('57) 24-33.

Justin Martyr wrote only a few paragraphs regarding public worship. Among them he describes how the Eucharist was celebrated in his day. Justin understands the whole service as the re-enactment of what Christ did at the Last Supper in every exact detail. With modern Christians only the words of institution are exactly the same. The parts of the service are the taking of the bread and wine, the blessing by means of thanksgiving, and the giving of the species which, Justin says, "we are taught is the flesh and blood of that Jesus." Justin mentions that the common meeting takes place on Sunday, for on this day Christ rose from the dead and taught His disciples. Sunday also recalls the creative activity of God and is the day of the Holy Ghost. For Justin the Eucharist is not isolated from all else in the Church. It is organically related to the whole of Christian living and connotes the idea of corporate oneness in Christ's Body.—R. V. D.

444. B. PRETE, "Vangelo e lavoro" *SacDoc* 1 ('56) 280-309.

One will not find a social or an economic treatise in the Gospels. Nevertheless, Christ did teach man how to approach the problems of everyday life. The real value of man's existence and of his activity derives from his supernatural end. Thus, man should not be oversolicitous about the food he must eat, the goods he possesses, or the work of his hands.

From a recent study by F. Gryglewicz ("La valeur du travail manuel dans la terminologie de la Bible," *Biblica* 37 ['56]) it is clear that human labor was elevated and given a new dignity by the preaching of Christ. *Banausos* does not appear in the NT at all. The word most commonly used for "work" is *ergon*; together with *ergates* and *ergazomai*, it does not retain any negative or pejorative connotations. Furthermore, *ponos* and *kopos* add a note of joy, a sense of approbation and praise, and suggest a new moral and religious significance for the concept of work.

Finally, R. P. Spiazzi remarks that work, in the light of Christ's teachings, is to be an instrument of justice or of grace or, better still, of Christ Himself who lives in the soul through grace.—G. Gm.

445. K. H. SCHELKLE, "Der Apostel als Priester," *TQ* 163 ('56) 257-283.

The word *hiercus* is not used of the apostles in the NT, but the apostolic office is there shown to be essentially priestly in the sense of being *mediatorial*—in both of its functions, of witness and offering, word and cult, preaching and sacrifice. Through the apostles God speaks to the Church and to mankind at large; and through them sacrifice and worship are offered to God. S collects passages from the Gospels and Epistles showing the mediatorial functions of the apostles as fishers of men, workers in the vineyard, bearers of God's revelation, ministers of reconciliation, etc. The reason for the avoidance of

hierous in the NT may be its pagan associations—just as in the LXX the Temple at Jerusalem is not called *hieron*.—J. F. Bl.

446. F. SONTAG, "Ontological Possibility and the Nature of God: A Reply to Tillich," *JR** 36 ('56) 234-240.

In his *Biblical Religion and the Search for Ultimate Reality* T rightly affirms that man's reception of revelation involves ontological questions. But he erroneously maintains that ontology requires a power-of-being above all beings, incompatible with the personal God of biblical religion. T attempts to give an existential solution to this conflict by invoking a state of (religious) faith mingled with (philosophic) doubt. His effort to reconcile religion and ontology by transcending both actually satisfies neither the demands of ontological inquiry nor those of biblical faith. He seems to conclude to a transpersonal God which is a denial of what biblical religion claims to have revealed.

A less rigid ontology might be more gentle to biblical religion. Not all ontologies are, like T's, opposed to personalism, ethical values, and historical transformation. A description of being which allows for possibility and infinity in the structure of God would make it clear that personality and freedom are central to His nature.—A. R. D.

447. J. B. SOUCEK, "The Good Shepherd and His Flock," *Ecumenical Review** 9 ('57) 143-153.

The image of the Good Shepherd appears in the OT, where it has a natural setting in the culture and ideology of the people. In the Synoptics, Luke's parable of the lost sheep opens the way towards a universalistic understanding of the flock of the true Shepherd. The step out of the provisional narrowness of the "little flock" (Lk 12:32) is indicated in Matthew's use of the shepherd motif in the great eschatological scene of Christ's judgment. As a common trait, the image in the Synoptics goes beyond the mere Messiahship of Jesus and bears directly on the structure of the people of God, on the means of transcending the limits of the old Israel, and on the faithful Shepherd who will save, reintegrate, the lost. Jn 10, stressing the mutual knowledge of shepherd and flock, has for its main theme the utter dependence of the flock on the person, voice, and work of Jesus, the Good Shepherd. He is the sole means of incorporation into the people of God, His personal self-sacrifice the basis of their existence and inner coherence, the *hearing* of His voice the only foundation for their integrity. Scattered instances in other NT books—Heb 13 implicitly and 1 Pt 5 explicitly—develop the notion of Church authority in the secondary shepherds, whose position rests solely on their fidelity to the one true Shepherd.—R. L. R.

448. G. STÄHLEN, "On the Third Day," *Interpretation** 10 ('56) 282-299.

Existential theology, while giving a central role to the Easter message, denies its historical foundation. The Easter accounts are discarded as un-

historical chiefly under these headings: (1) accounts that "prove" the Resurrection, such as the empty grave, the corporeal appearances, and the list of witnesses (1 Cor 15:5); (2) histories which bear the character of cult legend; (3) accounts of commissioning of the disciples. But these reasons can be shown to be unsound. Existential theology relies on a Resurrection which is only a faith experience, having made a virtue of a nonexistent necessity. Here are the facts of the Easter message: (1) there is no account of the actual raising of Jesus; (2) there is no reason to deny the events which *eo ipso* assert the reality of the Resurrection; (3) the fact of the Resurrection belongs to the earliest kerygma; (4) the contradictions which arise are inessential and disprove nothing; (5) there is a remarkable agreement on the earthly and un-earthly nature of Jesus after the Resurrection. Perhaps this blending of the worldly and the otherworldly is the heart of the Easter message.—J. A. Bs.

449. G. H. TAVARD, "Christianity and Israel: How did Christ Fulfill the Law?" *DowR* 75 ('57) 55-68.

To the problem stated in the title of this article and contained in Mt 5:17-18, Catholic theology offers several possible answers. In Paul, Torah (i.e. the Law) is the ceremonial and purity law which is the shadow of the New Covenant. Torah had been propaedeutic, valid for a time. Before it, moreover, God had been friendly with Abraham through faith, in the last analysis faith in Christ (1 Cor 10:1-4). In other words, unknown to Torah yet reached by faith, Christ was in the Old Testament. Torah was tutor for children. And though it is "malediction" since it forbids and punishes without justifying (Gal 3:10), still we uphold it—in its fulfilment that is, when it becomes the work of the Holy Spirit in us (Rom 8:3-4). This line of thought held considerable sway over the Fathers, e.g., Tertullian, Origen, who saw a continuity from Torah (shadow) through Gospel (image) to Resurrection (reality).

In a second line of thought (Acts 7:51-53), St. Stephen contrasts the great Law with the Hebrew failure to keep it. Christian literature echoed this comment. The regulations of Torah were symbols; true circumcision was of ears and heart. Understood literally Torah was death; understood spiritually it was the Gospel. Christ fulfilled Torah, uniting letter and spirit inseparably. Such was the teaching of St. Basil and St. Bonaventure.

A third conception we may call Johannine, a title little more than symbolic (cf. Jn 1:17; 7:19; and his frequent epithet "the Jews"). Early writings, and especially the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, distinguish between the perennial decalogue and the merely temporary law of ceremonies. Christ, in fulfilling the law, abolished Mishnah, i.e. "the second legislation," which was concerned with ceremonies and legal purity, and returned to the purity of Torah or decalogue, the universal law obscurely inscribed in all hearts as a natural moral code. T would agree with this third interpretation, without abandoning the other two. The striking ambiguity of the concept of Torah received from Judaism is sig-

nificant. Torah was unavoidably ambiguous, since it was not the ultimate revelation. It helps, too, to explain the Judaic rejection of Christ.—H. A. L.

450. T. F. TORRANCE, "One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith," *ExpT** 68 ('57) 111-114.

The NT conception of faith (*pistis*) is much more than faithfulness answering to and dependent upon the divine faithfulness, for in faith the intellectual element of belief is powerfully represented. Yet, this aspect itself is grounded upon the basic fact of the faithfulness of God and man's faithful response to His covenant mercies.

The fundamental significance of the Hebrew root *'mn*, meaning firm, steadfast (*'aman*, *'emunah*), is closely related to the intense family consciousness of the people. Above all, steadfastness is applied to God in His covenant faithfulness, and secondarily to the religious faithfulness of the people. Greek translation is difficult, *pistis* and *pisteuein* being poor equivalents for the Hebrew idea of faithfulness. *'Aman* may mean to make firm or to establish. It may also mean to believe, rely on; and LXX will translate by a form of *pisteuein*. But the emphasis throughout is establishment, reliance upon God or upon 'the Truth.' *'Emeth* (truth) itself rests on the same root as *'emunah*. Both words overlap. LXX translates by *aletheia* but means efficacious reality, God's covenant faithfulness, and not truth in any abstract sense. Even NT usage of *pistis* and *dikaiosune* must be read against this Hebrew background of *'emeth* and *'emunah*.

In the OT, when word (especially God's word) and event coincide, there is *'emeth*. In the NT, Jesus Christ is the incarnate faithfulness of God, the Word of God become event in our flesh in the fullest sense. Like the OT, the NT, too, emphasizes the faithfulness of God and requires the corresponding faithfulness of man. But the *pistis Iesou Christou* (e.g., Gal 2:16, 2:20, 3:22) is pre-eminently a polarized expression: Christ, the Truth of God, is the Truth of God become man, the Truth of God become truth of man, the actualization of man's *pistis* in covenant with God. This polarity of the faithfulness of God, on whom our salvation depends, and the faithfulness of Christ, who is not only Word of God but Believer, our vicarious Believer, who stood in our place and was faithful for us, is remarkably summed up in 2 Cor 1:18 f.—R. L. R.

451. T. O. WEDEL, "Bultmann and Next Sunday's Sermon," *AnglTR** 39 ('57) 1-8.

Bultmann's vivid existentialist interpretation of the Gospel has had very disturbing effects on Protestantism and may eventually induce a violent reaction back to Fundamentalism. Although Bultmann's "demythologizing" is disturbing, he is to be thanked for bringing out into the open a problem left over from an earlier time. Bultmann believes that the kerygma becomes the proclamation of the drama of death and resurrection which we must live today.—R. V. D.

ARCHAEOLOGY

452. M. AVI-YONAH, "The Excavations at Caesarea in 1956," *BIES* [in Hebrew] 20 ('56) 194-195.

With a subvention from the Rabinowitz Synagogue-Exploration Fund, the Hebrew University Archaeology Department shaved off 7 meters from a 600-meter-long strip of the Caesarea coast. Notable remains are attributed to the Hellenistic and Persian settlement, "Strato's Tower," which preceded Herod's vaunted construction of Caesarea out of nothing. From Herod's era appeared a solid public building with datable pottery. Later building phases show Jewish symbols.—R. N.

453. B. BAGATTI, "Scavo di un monastero al 'Dominus Flevit,'" *SBFLA* 6 ('55-'56) 240-270.

This monastery, dedicated to the Gospel prophetess Anna probably between 614 and 808, bears no apparent relation to the Gospel events on or near Olivet.—R. N.

454. D. BALDI, "I santuari di S. Giovanni Battista in Terra Santa," *SBFLA* 6 ('55-'56) 196-239.

The *iouda* of the Baptist's birth is not for Yuttah of Jos 15:55; 21:16, 10 km south of Hebron, as supposed by some Catholic topographers following Reland; less likely still is Juda of Nephthali in Galilee Jos 19:34 (Le Camus), or Beth-Zacharia 10 km SW of Bethlehem (Germer-Durand). There is a certain tradition in favor of Jerusalem or Bethlehem. But from the Crusade period onward, 'Ayn Karim prevails. On the site of the baptism of Jesus, even the strong tradition of 5 km north of the Dead Sea leaves many questions unanswered, chiefly, whether west or east bank. Albright's recent locating of Ainon near 'Ayn Far'a is questionable; Egeria's account suggests rather ad-Dayr 12 km south of Bet-Šan. The death of the Baptist at Machaerus is established by Josephus, though Christian sources are silent; an alternative "tradition" for Sebaste, dating from Theodosius A.D. 530, is based on a confusion with his *tomb* [the variant claim of Damascus does not fall within the frame of this study].—R. N.

455. R. BEAUVERY, "La route romaine de Jérusalem à Jéricho," *RB* 64 ('57) 72-101.

Asphalting of a new road from Cedron to Augusta-Victoria in 1950 laid bare five superposed layers of ancient roadbed, which when examined in 1955 contained only Roman pottery. The Jericho road probably issued from Jerusalem from the north, as Thomsen had claimed and as seems implied by Flavius' description of the dragging of siege-machines across Kedron to Hip-picus; rather than from the east (Sheep Gate, as in Grollenberg's Atlas). The continuation of the road is traced with an excellent map, via Bahurim as

identified by the excavation of E. Voigt *AASOR* 5 ('25) 67. West of Adum-mim a triple roadbed seems to imply successive stages: pre-Roman; 69 A.D. or earlier; 132 or later. Along the slope of Aqûbat al-Akrâd (wadi Qilt area), the upper road first noted in the 1935 survey seems strategically more plausible than the Tal'at-Damm wadi-road of the original *PEF*-survey, and is moreover archaeologically favored by retaining-wall remains. Along the route are various monuments: Qaşr 'Ali already studied in *PJB* 25 ('29) 118, a Wadi Sidr station here minutely analyzed, and various guard-posts. More plausible is the dating of the road under Vespasian 68-70 (Kuhl, Abel), though Avi-Yonah's claim of Hadrian 130 is based on observations which do indeed prove considerable restoration.—R. N.

456. E. R. GOODENOUGH, "The Bosphorus Inscriptions to the Most High God," *JQR** 47 ('57) 221-244.

Among the Bosphorus (kingdom on northern shore of the Black Sea) lapidary inscriptions studied sixty years ago by Schürer were twenty-one referring to "newly received brethren" who worship God Most High. Schürer denied they could be Jewish because (1) they mention a "priest," and (2) eagles were carved on at least five of the stones. Tomb and synagogue inscriptions show that the word "priest" was a living one among Jews of that period. G further points to the importance of the "priest" at Qumran, as attested in the *Manual of Discipline*. As to the eagles, they appear often on Palestinian synagogues (plates give illustrations) of Capernaum, el-Jish, Yafa, Khirbet Dubil, as well as on funerary decorations recently discovered at Beth Shéarim. Thus, the "newly received brethren" at Bosphorus were probably converts to Judaism. Nothing in their inscriptions is alien to known practices of loyal Jews of that period.—F. L. M.

457. E. R. GOODENOUGH, "Pagan Symbols in Jewish Antiquity" *Commentary** 23 ('57) 74-80.

The increasing discoveries of decorations on Jewish graves and synagogues from Greco-Roman times, with a strange combination of objects used in the Jewish worship and of figures from paganism, are more important than the Dead Sea Scrolls. Found on Jewish monuments in Rome, Southern Italy, Asia Minor, and Dura on the Euphrates, they pose a question for modern scholars, viz, how could the Jews have made these particular forms at that time and in that environment.

Ancient Jews seem to have borrowed ornaments that were symbolically dead; but later Jews borrowed those whose symbolism and value were very much alive: namely, Helios, the vine, the lion and the eagle, fish, bread, the boat, Pegasus, and various astral symbols. Inroads of Hellenistic influence manifest themselves in recently found amulets and magical incantations addressed to the God of the Jews. The proposed conclusion is that as mystic Jews, they were saying in symbolic language what pagans, and later Christians, were expressing by

the same vocabulary; they found in the symbols both stimulus and hope for their experiences without compromising their loyal obedience to Jewish law and customs as they knew them locally.—R. T. F.

458. E. GRIFFE, "L'histoire ecclésiastique à l'Académie française," *BLitE*, 4 ('56) 225-229.

In welcoming to the French Academy the famous historian, M. Jerome Carcopino, M. François-Poncet discussed the former's scientific work. Two items concern the early Church. The "magic square" cryptogram is of Christian origin and can be traced to Lyons in the time of St. Irenaeus, according to C. F-P disagrees with this view, pointing out that, if this were the case, more examples of such cryptograms would have been found in the catacombs.

With astonishing precision C has fixed the date for the transfer of the relics of the apostles Peter and Paul to the Catacombs of St. Sebastian on Sunday evening, Feb. 22, 258 A.D. They remained there until A.D. 336. On this point F-P is in agreement. Many arguments, however, deduced from the history of Roman liturgical customs and the condition of St. Peter's tomb itself, show that Feb. 22 commemorates the beginning either of the apostolate or of the episcopate of St. Peter and not the transferring of his relics.—R. B. C.

459. T. F. MEYSELS, "From the home-town of Our Saviour: recent archaeological discoveries at Nazareth—Byzantine mosaic and Burgundian sculpture," *ILN* 229 ('56) 1074-75.

When the seventeenth century church of the Annunciation at Nazareth was recently demolished, excavations to the west revealed the negative impression of first century Jewish Nazareth: rock-cut foundations of little houses, crypts with stairs, grain-bins with intricate ventilation-vents. A basement supported by two large columns parallels the two columns of the grotto of the Annunciation, believed to be a subterranean backroom of the house of Joseph. Deep beneath the demolished church lay traces of Byzantine mosaics belonging to the first modest shrine of Nazareth, measuring but 18 metres square. Above this lay the crusader's large cathedral and a medieval pilgrims' cemetery. Specimens of thirteenth century French Gothic sculpture, found in a crypt, were intended for a third rebuilding of the church which never took place.—G. G.

460. J. SHATTNER, "The Meanders of the Jordan," *BIES* [in Hebrew] 20 ('56) 145-151.

A geologist's viewpoint is applied in the OT language to the well-known vagaries of the most sacred river of Christian tradition.—R. N.

461. V. VILAR, "Cronica arqueologica de Palestina," *EstBib* 15 ('56) 301-320.

V summarizes the results of recent excavations and explorations. *Excavations*: Jericho: 1955, by K. M. Kenyon. *Conclusions*: the extension of the

town in the Neolithic Pre-Ceramic Age was almost as large as in the Bronze Age. New walls and graves were found. Dothan: 3rd expedition, by J. P. Free. Previous conclusions confirmed. Tell El Far'ah: 5th expedition, 1954, by De Vaux. The results suggest strongly the identity of Tell El Far'ah and Tirsā. Bethel: second expedition, by J. L. Kelso, confirmed the conclusions of the first expedition. Jerusalem: Ofel's wall and a canaanite tomb are the main finds. Nazareth: by Bagatti, on the site of the old Basilica of the Annunciation. It is possible to draw the designs of the two older Basilicas. Beersheba: 1954-55, by M. S. Perrot. Hazor: by Y. Yadin. In the Tell were found the remains of a large building, and in the military camp, two temples and some ceramics. Nahariya: 1954-55, by M. Dothan. New finds in the rectangular temple dug out in 1947. Beth Shearim: by N. Avigad. Four new catacombs were found and two inscriptions deciphered. Ramat Rachel: by Aharoni, 1954. Three levels uncovered in which three cities were placed. The first was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, the second by Titus, and the third is of a later date. Also a church and some seals were found.

Explorations: Search of Judah: by J. T. Milik and F. M. Cross, who identify three of the cities named in Jos 15:61-62. Gilgal: interesting studies by J. Muilenburg who concludes that Khirbet Mefjer is Gilgal. El Negueb: by N. Glueck, 1952-55; remains of agricultural life in Middle Bronze I and Iron II. —L. M.

462. L. VINCENT, "L'Eléona, sanctuaire primitif de l'Ascension," *RB* 64 ('57) 48-71.

The mosque "Imbomon" with the alleged footprints in the rock is at the highest point of Mt. Olivet. But slightly lower on the southward slope is the Carmelite convent of the *Pater noster*, claimed to be the true site of the Ascension by H. Vincent and F. Abel in *Jérusalem Nouvelle* (Paris, 1914) 337-360, 374-419. The proof is based upon the 1910 excavation of the White Father Léon Cré [*Oriens Christianus* N.S. 1 ('11) 119-134, 316-321], as illustrating two statements of Eusebius that Constantine's Ascension-sanctuary was, like his Bethlehem sanctuary, constructed around a cave. The same cave was believed to have served for eschatological discourses of Jesus, and thus to have fulfilled in a certain sense the oracles of Ez 11:22; Za 14:4. Only after 375 was the higher point *en Bômô* crowned with an "Ascension-sanctuary" by the matron Poemenia; and even there the alleged "footprints" were only gradually hinted at after 400. The position of Vincent was attacked by E. Wiegand *ZDPV* 38 ('15) 132-5; 46 ('23) 193-220 and defended by Vincent in a discussion pivoting unhappily about the question of how extensive and unjustified were the disfigurements of the French Eléona property wrought by the occupation of German soldiery. Meanwhile the intention of constructing here a grandiose basilica, resuscitated in 1945, was violently attacked: not because of the "Sacred Heart" title which for no explainable reason had become attached

to the project [which Vincent does not even mention, and which in recent announcements has been abandoned], nor because of the "Pater" tradition [which already Jerome *PL* 26,34 had categorically rejected], but precisely on the basis of the Ascension claim. Spearhead of the attack is André Grabar, *Martyrium: recherches sur le culte des reliques et de l'art chrétien antique* (Paris, 1946). Grabar's contentions of detail seem to be inadequately based upon measurement and observation. Also questioned in his allegedly "presupposed" fundamental contention that all such monuments were the expression of a sort of hero-cultus linked to an important scene: in this case, the alleged footprints.—R. N.

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

463. J. M. ALLEGRO, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL** 75 ('56) 174-187.

Qumran's Cave 4 has yielded four Messianic fragments. The first, a commentary on Gn 49:10, implies an early date for the Messianic interpretation of the passage. It further suggests that Za 9:9 depends on such an interpretation: "Until the Messiah of Righteousness (legitimate Messiah) shall come, the shoot of David. . . ." The notions of priestly and Davidic Messiahs seem associated; cf. NT use of the name of the priest-king Melchizedek as the prototype of Jesus.

The second document (4Q Florilegium) highlights 2 Sm 7:11 ff. One of the Messiahs is identified with the "Interpreter of the Law" known as the Teacher of Righteousness. We must identify the two Messianic figures in this document with the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.

The third document comprises a collection of fragments from a commentary on Isaiah (4QpIsa^a) referring events in Is 10-11 to the "War of the Kittim," which seems to have been regarded as a necessary preliminary to the final judgment and the institution of the Kingdom. We also seem to have a reference to the Messiah's point of departure, Acco (Ptolemais), on his triumphal march to Jerusalem. One fragment implies that the Davidic Prince's exacting standards of judgment are learned at the feet of his priestly tutors.

The fourth document (4Q Testimonia; cf. Dt 5:28-29; 18:18-19; Nm 24:15-17; Dt 33:8-11; Jos 6:26) illustrates the type of composite quotation well-represented in the NT. Moreover, an apocryphal work (in the fourth testimony) seems to be quoted alongside biblical texts. The first three *testimonia* refer to the prophetic, kingly, and priestly functions of the Messiah(s), whereas the fourth is concerned with the activities of "a man accursed." However, the point of contact among all four is not to be found in the personalities involved, but in the import of the final words of each; namely, the eschatological destruction visited (1) on those who do not listen to the Prophet, (2) on the enemies of the Star and Scepter, (3) on the opponents of the Levitical priesthood, and (4) on the city which had been rebuilt under a curse.—C. H. G.

464. M. BAILLET, "Fragments du Document de Damas, Qumrân Grotte 6," *RB* 63 ('56) 513-523.

The missing link between the Qumran sect and that of the Cairo Geniza's Damascus-Šadoqite document, suspected by Paul Kahle already in *Vetus Testamentum* 1 ('51) 45-48 and announced in *RB* 60 ('53) 86, consists of five fragments. Fragment 1, erroneously labeled Cave 4, but of provenance left uncertain, contains Zad-CDC 4:19-21 cursing the "builders of a wall" [previously invoked by Père Vincent as an attestation of the Bar-Kokba construction of the "fourth" (Robinson-Sukenik "third") North Wall of Jerusalem]. Fragment 2, from Cave 6, contains Zad 5:13-14 cursing "makers of fire." Fragment 3, the principal one, from Cave 6, contains Zad 5:18-6:2 foretelling the rise of seducers and "boundary-falsifiers." There are three orthographic variants from the known text: *'hrwn* and *yzkwr* with *ô* written fully; *ryšwn* with correct aleph written over the yod. Fragment 4, pseudo-Cave-4, contains Zad 6:20-7:1 mentioning the "holy offerings" to be "lifted" [Rabin "set aside"; || 2 Chr 30:24 "donated" (Buhl) or "taken up" (Baillet)]. Fragment 5, from [Pseudo?-] Cave 4, is not contained in Zad, but is perhaps from the lacuna before Zad 12:1, inculcating in its spirit the prohibition of sodomy in Lv 18:22; 20:13; chiefly on this Fragment 5 is based a generalized conclusion to "the existence of a Zad text notably longer than the one already known."—R. N.

465. R. E. BROWN, "The Messianism of Qumran," *CBQ* 19 ('57) 53-82.

Taking messiah to mean an agent sent in the final period by God to overcome the forces of evil and establish God's kingdom, three problems must be considered: (1) Was there one or two messiahs expected by Qumran? (2) Is the "messianic" psalm really messianic? (3) Was the Teacher of Righteousness a messianic figure, and what influence did he have on the messianism of Qumran? The publication of (1QS_a) and the *Benedictions* (1QS_b) have established the two messiah theory: the Messiah of Aaron and the Messiah of Israel. Before their coming (or contemporaneously) a prophet was expected—an idea which fitted into the post-exilic expectations of Judaism, yet still outside the bonds of strict Judaism. With the messiah's coming the final period begins in an eschatological battle under the direction of the Messiah of Aaron. Very possibly a new liturgy is established after the victory to replace the abuses at Jerusalem. Evidence of the two messiah theory is found also in the polemic of Hebrews (cf. 7:14-15) and in the rise of Simeon ben Koseba. Consideration of vv. 9-10 and 12 of the "messianic" psalm (1QH 3, 3-18) shows the weakness of the messianic interpretation. Still such a possibility remains, though the idea of a messiah coming "from below" is strange to Jewish apocalyptic thought. 1QpHab shows that the Teacher of Righteousness was a prophet in the Qumran sense; but, since his death is mentioned in CDC, he was not *the* prophet, nor was he identified with the Messiah of Israel; nor expected to return after death as one of the messiahs. Yet the Teacher did influence

Qumran's messianism, possibly because they connected his sufferings with those of the suffering servant of Is. But that Qumran had the idea of a suffering messiah, there is no conclusive evidence.—J. F. B.

466. J. CARMIGNAC, "L'utilité ou inutilité des sacrifices sanglants dans la 'Règle de la Communauté,'" *RB* 63 ('56) 524-532.

Serek 9:4 *mibb^eśar 'olôt* can mean expiation either "by means of" or "rather than" flesh of holocausts. The former interpretation, already preferred by a minority (Milik, del Medico) is now shown to be correct by a detailed parallel in *Milḥama* 2:5, "These will be charged with holocausts and sacrifices, to prepare a smoke of delight for God's good pleasure, to expiate for the congregation." The approbation of sacrifices is further confirmed by *Zad* 11:18-12:2 (compared with *Millḥ* 7:11; *Lv* 12:4) regulating their proper performance. Therefore any disapproval of sacrifice by the Essene community in Josephus *Ant* 18 (19) 1:5, or the silence of the *Scrōlls*, must be interpreted as merely awaiting the day when a more worthy community will supplant the one then serving the Temple.—R. N.

467. R. DE VAUX, "Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân: rapport préliminaire sur les 3^e, 4^e et 5^e campagnes," *RB* 63 ('56) 533-577.

Attribution of the three main building-periods to the Scroll users remains unchanged: Ia John Hyrcanus 135-104 B.C.; Ib Jannaeus 103-76 and until the earthquake of 31 B.C.; II 4-70 A.D. The outset-date of II has been mildly shaken by the discovery of 558 silver Tyrian coins of a minting datable to 8 B.C. but attested in use until eight years later. The astonishing number of cisterns, already queried by archaeologists, is defended; and even the use of many of them as ritual or domestic bath is disallowed. Iron-II pottery finds were sufficiently widespread to warrant postulating an earlier existence of the whole southeast half of the main building, as well as a round cistern and dependencies westward. This was probably under Ozias, as indicated in 2 Chr 26:10; but no relation whatever exists between his occupation and the *Scrolls*-community. Further grave-clearance reveals exclusively male burials rigidly oriented north-south in the principal terrace-cemetery; but in four subsidiary cemeteries not uniformly oriented, female interments predominate. Numerous jar-deposits of generally homogeneous animal-bones within the compound itself imply a usage inescapably cultic but not attested in the OT.—R. N.

468. A. JONES, "Apropos Four Recent Books on the *Scrolls*," *Scripture* 9 ('57) 21-26.

Do the Dead Sea *Scrolls* threaten the 'originality' of Christ? Obviously they do not threaten His theological uniqueness, but what of His historically verifiable preaching? To the literary critic versed in rabbinic writings there is no originality to be threatened; but to the critical historian the originality of His teaching remains untrammelled since it lies not in the individual moral

maxims but in all that lies behind them. The climax is not impending but rather is present in the person of Christ Himself. It is the Christology which gives substance to the moral aphorisms and it is only this living whole which comprises the 'originality' of Christ. To the historical philosopher the truth and originality of Christ's teaching is shown by the contrast of the subsequent oblivion of Qumran with the dynamism of Christianity; and if the historical philosopher has experienced this dynamism personally, then his judgment, the more valuable for this experience, will be preparatory to the act of faith by which he believes that Christ's truth is not only superior to Qumran but is itself absolute truth.—K. K.

469. K. KUHN, "Bericht über neue Qumrânfunde und über die Öffnung der Kupferrollen," *TL** 91 ('56) 541-546.

K raised a German fund for the purchase of Pešer Nahum naming Demetrius [III], and other 4Q scrolls; still others were purchased by the Vatican, McGill, and Manchester. H. W. Baker's Manchester unrolling of the copper scrolls brought the discovery that they contain some 3000 letters (characters) constituting the account of a hidden treasure—exactly as Kuhn's *RB* article had concluded from examining only the outside of the scrolls! A similar treasure-hunting is described in Josephus *JW* 6 (387-391) 8.—R. N.

470. J. LICHT, "The Term *gôrāl* in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Beth Mikra, Bulletin* [in Hebrew] of the Israel Society for Biblical Research* 1 ('56) 90-99.

This frequent term expresses the alleged dualism of the Qumran sect. Wherever men are gathered, there exist among them two "sorts" [in its Latin sense; it is noticeable that in English also both "lot" and "sort" have come to connote simply "category"]. "Men of God's lot" are opposed to "men of iniquity."—R. N.

471. R. MARCUS, "*Mebaqqer* and *Rabbim* in the Manual of Discipline vi.11-13," *JBL** 75 ('56) 298-302.

The Qumran *Manual of Discipline* vi.11-13 may throw some light on the relation between the *m^ebaqqer* of the community and the *rabbim*, and help determine whether *rabbim* means "teachers," "leaders," or "the many" in the sense of general membership. M gives a composite translation of the passage based on eleven translators consulted, with the dubious words merely transliterated. These are examined. The passage supports the meaning of *RBYM* as "general assembly" or "membership in the community," since "the supervisor of the *RBYM*" is more likely one in charge of the activity of the general membership than of a small group of masters. The final translation suggested understands the entire passage as detailing two regulations: (1) no one, not even the supervisor, shall address the members of the community without their permission; (2) no one may address the members without first standing up to ask this permission and waiting for approval to speak.—E. F. M.

472. C. MARTINI, "Il discernimento degli spiriti in un testo antico del deserto di Giuda," *CC* 107 ('56) 395-410.

Some writers see in the recently found *Manual of Discipline* (rules of the monastic-like Qumran community) the first formulation of the classic doctrine on the discernment of spirits. This truly profound religious document would thus have influenced the apocryphal *Fourth Book of Esdras*, the later Judaeo-Christian *Barnabas*, *Shepherd of Hermas* and *Didache*. The idea of the two spirits, continued in Philo, Plutarch, and the ascetical tradition of the Church, would finally be formulated in the famous rules of St. Ignatius Loyola on discernment of spirits in the *Spiritual Exercises*. It is certainly true that the ascetical ideals of the Qumran community are an important element of the environment in which Jesus announced His message from on high.

The doctrine is presented in the *Manual* as "instruction on the two spirits," which are truth (the prince of light) and iniquity (the angel of darkness), engaged respectively in good and bad works, influencing men toward a life of virtue and reward or a life of evil and eternal punishment. There is a strong basis of OT thought founded on rigid monotheism: God is the one source of all, as in Jn 1:3; God has a plan of creation; evil is due to privation; God creates man and confronts him with the two spirits. The *Manual's* concept of man's struggle in this life probably presupposes objective elements (angelology, fall of the angels, temptation of man) which have been imperceptibly transferred to the subjective, psychological, ethical, ascetical level. The *Manual* conceives the struggle between the spirits for man's soul as a matter of the activity of God and His angels and of the evil spirits, with both sides acting as exterior forces.

There are similar elements in St. Paul (cf. Gal 5:16-17, 5:10 ff., etc.), but Paul's concept of man's ascetical activity in this life is really quite different. Justification, for Qumran, amounted to an external purification which expressed itself in observance of the externals of community life; in St. Paul justification is achieved by the internal activity of the Holy Spirit and the redemptive activity of Christ with a transformation and elevation of man to sonship of God, manifested not in a multitude of precepts but in charity. Revelation of the Trinity makes the difference; Paul's doctrine on the spirits is specifically Christian.—W. M. A.

473. S. MOWINCKEL, "Some Remarks on *Hodayot* 39.5-20," *JBL** 75 ('56) 265-276.

Baumgarten and Mansoor's excellent interpretation of a thanksgiving hymn, found in 1947 along with many other Dead Sea documents (*JBL* 74 ['55] 192-195), is deficient in two respects. First, their verse-line arrangement is not consonant with the rules of Hebrew metrics. An alternate arrangement is given, which shows that the metrical and poetical rules of classic Hebrew poetry are followed only to a limited degree. Secondly, their translation of Hebrew tenses is too mechanical. A translation should be based on a literary-typological

analysis of the text (*Gattungsforschung*), in contradistinction to a strictly grammatical analysis. In the light of the typology of a thanksgiving psalm, the classic pattern emerges, although in a somewhat disintegrated state. The speaking Ego is not the community personified, but an individual, beset by human enemies attacking him with demonic force, yet saved through God's intervention. Only by a study of the whole group of hymns can any progress be made in ascertaining the identity of the speaker. As Sukenik suggests, the speaker may quite possibly be the Teacher of Righteousness and the author of the whole collection of *Hodayot*.

An appended note discusses the woman in travail in *Hodayot* Pl. 36:31-37:18. It is not an account of the birth of the Messiah, as Chamberlain and Dupont-Sommer interpret it, but a simile illustrating the sufferings of the worshiper, as Silberman has suggested in *JBL* 75 ('56) 96 ff.—W. P. K.

474. JULIAN OBERMANN, "Calendric Elements in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *JBL** 75 ('56) 285-297.

Several passages in the Scrolls have been seen by scholars to indicate that the Jewish sect represented by these documents followed a religious calendar different from the calendar of their Jewish opponents, presumably the Pharisees. It has been proposed that the calendar of this sect was similar to, or identical with, the one described in the Book of Jubilees.

These Scroll passages are variations on a single theme: pleas in defense of the sect's time-reckoning. They aim to repudiate the Pharisaic claims of authority over the calendar. The Pharisees held their time-reckoning to be God-given only in the sense that the prerogative to regulate the calendar was given them by divine revelation to Moses. Legal authority over determining periods and seasons, months and years, had been vested in them by virtue of their being Moses' duly qualified successors. The spokesmen of the Qumran sect repudiate this by emphasizing that all calendric data are preordained and hence immutable. Human initiative and decision cannot be permitted to determine the falling of periods and seasons. In matters of the calendar, only one design, one plan, wields authority: that which God "had designed"; "another plan never was, and never will be."

The identity of the sect's calendar with that of the Jubilees is *not* an established fact. Therefore we cannot imagine the numbers of the sect's Temple personnel as corresponding with its calendric periods.—V. A. M.

475. H. H. ROWLEY, "4QpNahum and the Teacher of Righteousness," *JBL** 75 ('56) 188-193.

The 4QpNahum Qumran text is extremely important because it contains evidence of real historical persons in whose world the sect lived. However, J. M. Allegro's statements, based on this text, that the Teacher of Righteousness was crucified by Alexander Jannaeus in the time of Demetrius III, are not supported by the text itself.

There are several difficulties with Allegro's interpretation of the text. He identifies the Demetrius mentioned with Demetrius III. There is no external evidence for this. The Jannaeus theory of Allegro is supported by supplying missing words. But other words can just as easily be supplied that do not support this meaning.

Mr. Allegro thinks the crucifixion of the Teacher of Righteousness to have been of comparable significance for the sect with the Crucifixion of Jesus for the Christians. But we have no evidence that the Teacher of Righteousness was crucified by Jannaeus. Mr. Allegro infers this fact, although the Teacher of Righteousness is not so much as mentioned in this text. There is even some doubt whether the text refers to a crucifixion at all. "It would seem that there is too much inference and too little evidence."

There is another possible interpretation of this text but only a probable one. It is likely that the Antiochus mentioned is Antiochus Epiphanes and that the reference to the Kittim here is to the Romans. There is external evidence for this in 1 Mac 9:5.

With these and other general considerations we can hold as more probable that the Teacher of Righteousness belongs to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and not that of Jannaeus.—F. M. H.

476. S. ZEITLIN, "How Ancient are the Hebrew Scrolls from the Dead Sea?" *Judaism** 6 ('57) 55-58.

A. M. Haberman in the previous issue of *Judaism* criticized the view that the Scrolls are late. The present article, disagreeing with Haberman, asserts the following points: archaeology cannot be a criterion for the antiquity of the Scrolls, as Bedouins, not archaeologists, found them; the orthography of the Scrolls is so poor that it is obviously a copy of some illiterate scribe of the Middle Ages; the *scriptio plena* used proves a late date; references to laws which were enacted after the destruction of the Second Temple prove the late date; the absence of the Tetragrammaton is a late feature; the authors of the Scrolls were undoubtedly acquainted with the Targum according to Jonathan; there is no probable connection between the Qumran jars and the date of the Scrolls, as the Scrolls cannot be proved to have been in the jars or, even if they were, they could have been placed in antique jars at any time.—R. V. D.

477. S. ZEITLIN, "The Dead Sea Scrolls: 1. The Lamech Scroll—A Medieval Midrash; 2. The Copper Scrolls; 3. Was Kando the Owner of the Scrolls?" *JQR** 47 ('57) 235-268.

Z continues to attack the antiquity of the scrolls and, among other arguments points out the confusion concerning the original owner of the documents (Kando?). Z's position is: "I suggested in my lecture at the Hebrew University of June 18, 1951, that an impartial, international committee, consisting of Jewish and Christian scholars and laymen should be formed to make a thorough investigation about the discovery of the Hebrew Scrolls. My request has been

ignored as have been my arguments against their antiquity. It is again my humble opinion that the XXIV International Oriental Congress which is to be held in Munich in the month of August of 1957 should appoint such a committee. This would be of great service to scholarship."—J. J. C.

APOCRYPHA, EARLY CHURCH

478. I. BAER, "Israel, the Christian Church, and the Roman Empire from the Days of Septimius Severus to the 'Edict of Toleration' of 313 C.E.," *Zion*,* a [modern Hebrew] *Quarterly for Research in Jewish History* 21 ('56) 1-49.

From a comparison of the teachings of the sages of Israel with their Christian contemporaries, it appears that both the synagogue and the early Church recognized their struggle with the Roman Empire as inherent in their providential historical mission. The early Fathers describe the Gentile church as a black-skinned foundling and [potentially Christian] Jewry as a "royal prince who had been slightly tanned by the sun in the distant past when he had sinned in worshiping the Golden Calf."—R. N.

479. R. C. FULLER, "The two 'gospels' of St. Thomas," *The Tablet* 208 ('56) 549-50.

Among the Coptic MSS discovered in 1945 at Nag-Hammadi in Upper Egypt are twenty pages of "sayings of Jesus" attributed to Thomas the Apostle, probably a translation of a second century Greek original. A similar Greek MS fragment from Oxyrhynchus in the British Museum may be part of the Greek original. Though containing some sayings not found elsewhere this work was obviously not written by Thomas, nor is it strictly-speaking a gospel, for there is no narrative. Many questions have been raised by the new find, but one question is foremost in the popular mind—is this a fifth "gospel"? This question is not new; it was asked more frequently in the second century and answered in the negative. The earliest lists give only four Gospels. The Church's duty is to preserve, not add to, the deposit of revelation, which closed with the death of the last apostle. Hence, not even the Holy Father could announce a new book to be added to the canon of Scripture.—G. G.

480. G. QUISPEL, "An Unknown Fragment of the Acts of Andrew," *ViCh* 10 ('56) 129-148.

Among Coptic papyri recently purchased for the Utrecht University library were five pages of an apocryphal writing in Sahidic with the title "The Act of Andrew." The fragment, here translated into English with a photograph of the last page of the text, recounts a conversation between Andrew and a soldier "in whose body was hidden a demon." The demon is expelled; the soldier wants to sell all he has in order to acquire the garment of the immortal king of the ages. The Coptic text is certainly a translation from Greek. The story may be from the original Acts of Andrew, a lost writing, one of the five leading

apostolic romances. The Acts showed considerable Gnostic influence and should perhaps be dated before 200 A.D.—W. M. A.

481. W. C. VAN UNNIK, "The Origin of the Recently Discovered 'Apocryphon Jacobi'," *ViCh* 10 ('56) 149-156.

An apocryphal writing attributed to James forms the first part of "Codex Jung" (from the library of a Gnostic sect discovered in 1945 at Nag-Hammadi). The work recounts a special instruction given James and Peter by Jesus, on behavior towards persecution and the possibility of prophecy, and concludes with a curious description of the Ascension. It is not very probable that a Gnostic wrote it, since typically Gnostic ideas (aeons, the unknown Father, etc.) are missing; concepts and terms are in the NT manner. The work shows no interest in Jewish matters. Two of the central ideas in *2d Clement* are found, but the apocryphon is completely uneschatological. The same tradition seems to underlie the *Ascension of Isaiah* and this apocryphon. There is nothing "unorthodox" in the Christology; there is nothing of docetism. The text must have been written before the NT Acts became generally known. It may originate from a small village church not yet affected by Gnosticism, between 125-150 A.D.—W. M. A.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SUPPLEMENT

Theology Digest 5 (1, '57) [*St. Marys, Indiana, \$2.00 a year*] contains the following summaries of articles on the NT and related fields:

F. Taymans, "Le miracle, signe du surnaturel," *NRT* 77 ('55) 225-245—TD, "Miracles, signs of the supernatural," 18-23.

A. Vaccari, "Il divorzio nei Vangeli," *CC* 107 ('56) 475-484—TD, "Divorce in the gospels," 31-33.

J. Dupont, "*A propos du nouvel Enchiridion Biblicum*," *RB* 62 ('55) 414-419—TD, "The force of the decrees of the Biblical Commission," 38.

D. J. McCarthy, "Qumran and Christian Beginnings," TD, 39-47.

S. Lyonnet, "Le Péché originel et l'exégèse de Rom. 5:12-14," *RSR* 44 ('56) 63-84—TD, "Original sin and Romans 5:12-14," 54-57.

S. Lyonnet, "Le sens de *eph ho* en Rom. 5:12 et l'exégèse des Pères grecs," *Biblica* 36 ('55) 436-456—TD, "The meaning of *eph ho* in Rom. 5:12," 63.

PUBLICATIONS OF WESTON COLLEGE PRESS

Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J. *Foreword to the Old Testament Books*. 2nd printing. 118 pages. \$1.00.

A. C. Cotter, S.J. *Theologia Fundamentalis*. 2nd edition. 1947. 737 pages. \$6.00.

———. *The Encyclical "Humani Generis" with a Commentary*. 2nd edition, 1952. 114 pages. \$1.00.

———. *ABC of Scholastic Philosophy*. 4th printing. 434 pages. Cloth Bound \$3.25. Paper Bound \$2.50.

———. *Natural Species*. 274 pages. \$2.00.

John C. Ford, S.J. *Depth Psychology, Morality and Alcoholism*. 88 pages. \$1.00.

BOOKS AND OPINIONS

(The asterisk is not employed in this section.)

The present issue of BOOKS AND OPINIONS has been prepared by the following: J. B. Coll, J. L. Connor, H. A. Levy, L. J. O'Toole, A. F. Reddy, R. L. Richard, F. X. Shea, R. L. Twomey.

SYNOPTICS

BOOK:

482r. P. PARKER, *The Gospel before Mark* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953, \$6.60) ix and 266 pp.

From a minute literary and stylistic criticism P distinguishes three sources for the Synoptic Gospels. With Vaganay P accepts an Ur-Mt, showing that the common source of both Mt and Mk is Aramaic Mt. Establishing the "Sitz im Leben" of the times, P affirms that the predominant controversy in the Church concerned the value of the Mosaic law for the Judaeo-Christians. Mt reflects this controversy very well, while Mk has sifted out all Jewish elements. P assigns a late date to primitive Mt: the reign of Domitian. An important original Jewish-Christian document (K) was used by both Mt and Mk.

OPINION:

483r. A. WIKGREN in *JR* 35 (3, '55) 180-181 feels that this theory belongs to modern Roman Catholic reconstructions seeking to preserve dogmatic priority of Mt as well as to recognize results of critical Gospel studies. "Serious and close scrutiny of the data" leaves the hypothesis with inconclusive evidence. A. VIARD in *RSPT* 39 ('55) 275 states that P has no foundation for omitting the Petrine texts in Mk, especially since P holds that Peter corrected this gospel. Mk is no other than an edition of primitive Mt. J. SCHMID in *TRev* 52 (2, '56) 55-56 summarizes in detail P's hypothesis but gives no evaluation.

BOOK:

484r. W. E. BUNDY, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955, \$7.50; England: Geoffrey Cumberledge, 1955. 60s net.) xxiii and 598 pp.

This study is intended as a "sequel and companion" to B's *Syllabus and Synopsis of the First Three Gospels*. The critical approach is generally negative, except in some solutions arrived at from the methods of form-criticism.

OPINION:

485r. A. WIKGREN in *JR* 36 (2, '56) 131-132 regrets the lack of consideration of the early Christian community. Its religious faith—an important constituent of that environment—is omitted, although it has place in accurate historical evaluation. The critical-liberal viewpoint is reflected in the "somewhat eclectic treatment of the materials." WIKGREN again, this time in *ChC* 73 (1, Jan. 4, '56) 15-16 notices that there are numerous recent and important Synoptic studies "insufficiently recognized in the present volume." (There is no mention

of Qumran discoveries or even of the term "Essene.") J. SCHMID in *TRev* 52 (2, '56) 55 and F. MCCOOL in *VD* 34 (1, '56) 50-51 agree. McCool notes that this rationalistic study is valuable for offering a clear, orderly compendium of that school's criticism. C. L. MITTON in *ExpT* 57 (4, '56) 106-107 admits that, "Much as we may dissent," this book compels one to reconsider the grounds for historical reliability of Synoptic tradition. "With Bultmann he (Bundy) believes that the Gospel tradition contains only the smallest amount of reliable historical material. . . . There is little left of the deeds and words ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels." Finally, "It is refreshing here and there to find an admission that some word or incident may be regarded as historical, but they are very few." All reviewers attest the high level of scholarship, but are generally disappointed in the refusal to employ recent scientific methodology.

BOOK:

486r. W. L. KNOX, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels: Vol. I: St. Mark*, ed. H. Chadwick (London: Cambridge University Press, 1953, \$4.00), xiv and 162 pp.

With detailed examination and comparison of Synoptic data, K has attempted to identify many of the oral and written sources of these Gospels, with special reference in this volume to Mk. Large blocks of material are considered as the immediate sources, while the methods of form-criticism are intentionally bypassed. The "Twelve Source" theory of E. Meyer is utilized in accounts of Jesus' ministry and Passion narrative.

OPINION:

487r. All reviewers note that K disagrees in general with methods of form-criticism, but that he admits, nevertheless, their value in determining some parts of the oral tradition. A. WIKGREN in *JR* 35 (3, '55) 181-182 notes that K is motivated "by a desire to enhance the historical reliability of the narrative through questioning the methods of form-criticism." Interesting and valuable are the "footnote citations of Jewish and Hellenistic parallels to Gospel data." J. SCHMID in *TRev* 52 (2, '56) 51-52 praises the fine scholarship on sources, but notes that the conclusions lead only to probability at most. K shows greater historical fidelity in the written Gospels since he shortens the period between the occurrence of Gospel events and their first writing down to about thirty years (absolutely no more than forty). H. GREEVEN in *TL* 81 (7-8, '56) 439-442 writes at length about K's animosity towards form-criticism. K feels that this school may easily lead critics into "heresies." While the thorough research into Judaeo-Christian controversy is rewarding and praiseworthy, at times K lacks clarity in stating just what he intends to prove. Finally, S. ZEITLIN in *JQR* 45 (3, '54-'55) 268-270 in a two page review offers little to the discussion. He calls the book "significant."

BOOK:

488r. H. A. GUY, *The Origin of the Gospel of Mark* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955, \$2.50; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1954), 176 pp.

Since the time of Papias the unsolved problem of the order and disorder in Mk has led scholars to propose various solutions. After reviewing various previous solutions, G proposes a threefold hypothesis to account for recurring abruptness in the narrative. (1) On small papyrus sheets the episodes of the tradition were recorded just as the preachers recounted them. (2) Mark, as compiler, gave them a tentative arrangement. (3) An editor was left with the problem of connecting the unfinished work without disturbing the "order" of the compiler.

OPINION:

489r. The assembled reviewers seem to be split on the value of G's hypothesis. Thus T. S. KEPLER in *JBL* 35 (3, '56) 250-251 acknowledges that his fresh scholarship offers a constructive critical approach and original appreciation of Mk. A. VIARD, however, in *RSPT* 39 ('55) 274-275 indicates that the solution is too mechanical. It lacks sufficient consideration of current theological opinion on the authorship of Mk. By crediting "preachers" with many important passages which scholars in general have attributed to Jesus Himself, the lead writer in *ExpT* 66 (1, '54-'55) 2-3 notes that "Mr. Guy makes us feel that the first preachers were sometimes too brilliant to be credible and sometimes too stupid for words." The *ExpT* goes on to say ". . . he does not fail to give a competent account" of previous solutions. But P. W. MEYER in *ChC* 73 (40, Oct. 3, '56) 1134-1136 believes that G is "less than fair" to the other hypotheses, while his own answers are in many ways unsatisfactory. Meyer notes that in G's oversimplification of order *vs.* disorder ". . . the notorious feeding doublet is an instance of 'disorder' if nonrepetition is one's canon." Finally, J. C. FENTON in *Theology* (418, '55) 158-159 adds nothing to the above notices. His only criticism in a noncommittal review is that the book "contains a number of slips," i.e., errors of reference.

FOUR BOOKS ON PAUL

BOOK:

490r. J. MUNCK, *Paulus und die Hielsgeschichte*, Acta Jutlandica: Aarsskrift for Aarhus Universitet, 26, I. Teologisk Serie, No. 6 (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1954, Da. Kr. 28), 342 pp.

A collection of previously published articles, the subject matter of the title is fairly briefly treated, followed by several related topics: the call of Paul, his treatment of Judaizers, unity in the early Church, Paul's idea of the true apostleship, his manifesto of faith, and his trial. Also subjected to criticism are the Tübingen school and the value of Acts in reconstructing Paul's history.

OPINION:

491r. P. NOBER in *VD* 34 (2, '56) 115-117, after noting the polemic against Tübingen, pinpoints M's basic theory: Paul, precisely as the Apostle of the Gentiles, plays a unique eschatological role in the history of salvation. Following Cullmann's exegesis of 2 Thes 2:6 ff., M pictures Paul's mission as the obstacle preventing Antichrist and the parousia, for these must follow Israel's

conversion. But Israel will be converted only through emulating the Gentile converts. Thus, the conflict between Peter and Paul was not doctrinal, but methodological: Peter striving to convert the Gentiles through a converted Israel, and Paul vice versa. The reviewer hesitates to pass a definitive judgment until M's promised book on apostleship in the NT should appear. P. S. MINEAR in *JBL* 75 (1, '56) 75-76 remarks that the many controversial hypotheses add up to a strikingly new picture of Paul and the early Church. He applauds the attack on the Tübingen heirs who are responsible for current basic misunderstandings of Paul. Although M has justly given a severe jolt to various modern rationalizations of Paul's role, he overstates his supporting evidence. But the total weight is convincing. H. H. ROWLEY in *ExpT* 67 (9, '56) 286 lists the major topics of the work. He considers it as a highly valuable critical introduction to recent Pauline studies, and praises M's own acute comments concerning Paul's mind and the situation he had to confront. A. VIARD in *RSPT* 40 (1, '56) 150-151 believes that these theories, colliding as they do with Baur, will occasion fruitful discussions since the Tübingen tradition, although it has abandoned certain exaggerations, still continues to speak of Paul and the other apostles as two irreconcilable voices in the primitive Church. R. H. FULLER, however, in *JTS* 6 (2, '55) 284-287 judges the sweeping indictment of the Tübingen school to be insufficiently qualified, especially since Baur's false methodology is as little supported today as the Tübingen chronology. M also oversteps his own basically sound method by manufacturing a discrepancy between Acts 15 and Gal 2 in order to vindicate his elimination of a Christian judaizing party from the early Church. O. KUSS in *TG* 46 (6, '56) 462-463 is puzzled by the lack of cohesion between several apparently disparate hypotheses, and by the slight coverage devoted to the subject implied in the title. These lacunae will probably be filled by M's promised book on the nature of apostleship in the NT.

BOOK:

492r. A. M. HUNTER, *Interpreting Paul's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1955, \$2.50), 144 pp.

Part I sketches the Pauline doctrine of salvation as a past event, a present experience, and a future hope. Part II, the James Sprunt Lectures given at the Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia in 1954, proclaims in vigorous modern idioms the pertinence of this gospel to man in his contemporary predicament.

OPINION:

493r. C. SPICQ in *FZPT* 2 (2, '55) 228-229 exclaims, "*Sobria ebrietas!*" This remarkably successful synthesis of Pauline thought exhibits a profound sense of religious values, moderated by a sane critic, but vigorously adapted to the world and words of today. The theme is salvation, whole and entire, not merely justification by faith. And yet, J. BOURKE in *Blackfriars* 36 ('55) 452-453 views the book as vitiated precisely by the basic Protestant error of *sola fides* and

imputed justification: “. . . one point after another is interpreted in the irreconcilably Protestant sense. . . .” But Catholics are indebted for H’s remarkable gift of assembling relevant material and for his keen awareness of and sympathy with the confusion and insecurity of our generation. J. J. DOUGHERTY, in *CBQ* 17 (4, ’55) 669 stresses rather the closer approximation to Catholic tradition due to the current trend in Protestant theology to exegete more historically and objectively. Although the clear and concise book may contribute to the ecumenical movement, its willingness to challenge fundamental data of faith is regrettable. A. VIARD in *RSPT* 39 (2, ’55) 286 remarks briefly that in this excellent introduction to Paul’s thought, nothing essential is missing and everything is in its proper place. N. A. HUFFMAN in *JR* 36 (4, ’56) 283-284 admires the attempt to translate Paul for “the man in the street,” who, “if he is in despair,” will see the pertinence of this teaching. The leader writer in *ExpT* 66 (2, ’54) 33-34 uses his review as an occasion to scold “theological mandarins” for their snobbery toward more directly evangelical scholarship. H, therefore, is highly praised for his popular presentation of Paul to our despairing generation. H has no truck with the opinion that Paul was the villain responsible for the poisoning of the pure milk of the gospel; rather he was thoroughly loyal to the primitive kerygma.

BOOK:

494r. F. MUSSNER, *Christus, Das All und Die Kirche: Studien zur Theologie des Epheserbriefes*, Trierer Theologische Studien, No. 5 (Trier: Paulinus Verlag, 1955, DM 17.80), xv and 175 pp.

In this study Mussner thoroughly investigates and finally rejects the Schlier-Käsemann theory that Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians is essentially a form of Gnostic thought. His method, preceded by a careful exposé of Gnosticism, is “text-analyse,” the exegetical analysis of so-called Gnostic words and passages.

OPINION:

495r. For C. L. MITTON in *JTS* 7 (2, ’56) 289-291 this book is an example of the “weighty contributions” that “Roman Catholic scholars are making . . . to our understanding of the Bible. . . .” For him as well as for A. VIARD in *RSPT* 40 (1, ’56) 155-156, P. BENOIT in *RB* 63 (3, ’56) 464-465, and P. GAECHTER in *ZKT* 78 (2, ’56) 239, its main conclusion is completely convincing and its exegetical effort of the highest quality and of permanent value. Apart from these salient points there is little agreement among the critics. Mitton objects to Christ’s identification with the Church “in more than a metaphorical sense”; Benoit (with Gaechter, it would seem) objects to making *body of Christ* too much of a metaphor. In *TL* 81 (10, ’56) 586-590 E. KÄSEMANN sets out, as we would expect, rather detailed objections. He criticises at length Mussner’s interpretation of *soma*, *ta panta*, *pleroma*, to mention but a few, and lauds the careful scholarship of the book with an odd metaphor: “. . . not only in the Bultmann school but also in Trier must one cook with water.” He rejects Mussner’s conclusions but finds the discussion with him a stimulus to re-test

his hypotheses and thereby to arrive at a better interpretation. Cf. also reviews by O. KUSS in *TG* 45 (5, '55) 390 and K. SCHELKLE in *TQ* 135 ('55) 349-350.

BOOK:

496r. E. BEST, *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: S.P.C.K., 1955, 25s.), xii and 250 pp.

From a systematic examination of relevant terms in St. Paul, B draws several conclusions of which these are the core: (1) *In Christ* and *body* are metaphors, "projections" of the idea of the corporate personality of Christ and the Church, who remain, however, distinct from each other. (2) The metaphor *body* concerns the inward life and structure, not the work, of the Church. It does not include the idea "extension of the Incarnation."

OPINION:

497r. In agreement with B's central thesis are C. F. D. MOULE in *JTS* 7 (1, '56) 114-117 and A. M. HUNTER in *ExpT* 66 (8, '54-'55) 229-230. They see in it a "notable contribution" to current ecclesiology. The former does criticize the "unitary" exegesis of *in Christ*, but he considers it "mostly incidental" to the main conclusions. However, the *London Times* reviewer in *TLitS* (May 20, '55) 273 vigorously declares that B has not allowed sufficiently for the fact that Paul was groping after a terminology and varying the content of body of Christ to suit the moment. The "simple consistency" postulated of St. Paul's words is perhaps responsible, the same reviewer continues, for both of the fundamental propositions of the study. Against the second of those propositions he proposes rather solid arguments, although Hunter merely "suspects" that "many will be troubled" and Moule predicts "some hard thinking" will have to be done. Like the *Times* reviewer, A. VIARD, in *RSPT* 40 (1, '56) 153 finds fault with the rigorous logic of B's interpretation of *in Christ*. He claims that the author was imperfectly aware that the Epistles were "écrits de circonstance," outstripped in completeness of doctrine by other passages in Scripture.

Finally, all the reviewers loudly applaud the patient scholarship of this work. Cf. also review by J. R. NELSON in *Ecumenical Review* 8 (3, '56) 338-339.

JOHANNINE WRITINGS

BOOKS:

498r. R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Die Johannesbriefe*, Theologischer Kommentar zum NT, XIII, 3, hrsg. A. Wikenhauser (Freiburg: Herter Verlag, 1953, in Leinen 22 DM, broschiert 19 DM), xx and 300 pp.

J. BONSIRVEN, *Épîtres de Saint Jean*, Verbum Salutis, IX (Nouv. éd., Paris: Beauchesne, 1954), 280 pp.

OPINION:

499r. Reviews of S's volume are uniformly favorable. Detailed analysis and very high praise are given by J. BONSIRVEN in *Biblica* 36 ('55) 117-118, G. R.

in *EstEc* 29 ('55) 410, WENNEMER in *Scholastik* 30 ('55) 616, and J.-L. D'ARAGON in *ScEcc* 7 (1, '55) 110-113.

500r. B's excellent book is praised chiefly for contributions already made in the 1936 edition. Regret that the present edition does not live up to its promise of being "entièrement revue" is expressed by several of the reviewers here listed: R. BROWN in *CBQ* 18 (1, '56) 114-115, S. DE AUSEJO in *EstBib* 15 (1, '56) 129-130, a reviewer in *ExpT* 67 (12, '56) 373-374, M.-E. BOISMARD in *RB* 63 (1, '56) 142, A. VIARD in *RSPT* 39 ('55) 280-281, A. KLEINHAUS in *Antonianum* 30 ('55) 319, and J. HARVEY in *ScEcc* 8 (3, '56) 385.

BOOK:

501r. C. K. BARRETT, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (London: S.P.C.K., 1955, 63 s. net), 531 pp.

In this careful and conservative study, at once theological and critical, B, a lecturer at Durham University, has done much to fill the need for a thorough, up-to-date English commentary on the Fourth Gospel. The last to appear on the Greek text was Archbishop Bernard's in 1928.

An introduction of 121 pages treats of the style of the Gospel, non-Christian and Christian backgrounds, theology, including eschatology, Christology, soteriology, sacraments, mysticism, Holy Spirit and Trinity, Church, the origin and authority of the Gospel, and finally, the text. In the commentary, which follows in substance the text of Westcott and Hort, the study of each paragraph is preceded by a summary of its meaning, its place in the development of the Gospel, and its connection with other NT teaching.

Among B's conclusions considered more important by reviewers, we may note: the writer of the Gospel and the writers of the Epistles and final version of the Apocalypse were all pupils of the original writer of the Apocalypse, who may or may not have been the apostle John; the date of the Gospel is between A.D. 90-140; no satisfactory and conclusive case can be made out for either Ephesus, Alexandria, or Antioch as the place of writing; the author was probably familiar with Mark, and to a less degree with Luke; although he presupposes Paul, he shows no direct knowledge of him; the majority of displacement and redaction theories are unproved and unnecessary; the hypothesis that the Johannine discourses were in the first place sermons delivered by the Evangelist "has much to commend it"; though there is valuable historical material in John, it is idle to seek in John a chronology of the ministry of Jesus.

OPINION:

502r. Since all the reviews of this book considered by NTA, with perhaps the exception of one (that by the reviewer for *Blackfriars*—cf. below) are favorable, and in most cases quite so, the abstracts of opinion here presented will not multiply quotations of general praise. Rather we shall limit ourselves to citing one or two comments of interest from each.

503r. V. TAYLOR in *ExpT* 67 (1, '55) 7-8 considers "vulnerable" B's "... consistent rejection of all theories of displacement, even as regards chapters 5 and 6, and 15-16, and his marked unwillingness to accept alleged 'Semitisms.'" R. T. STAMM in *JBL* 75 (4, '56) 346-349 observes, "... a distinctive feature of this commentary is its recognition of the inadequacy of eschatology." Moreover, by "... interpreting the Gospel of John in relation to its total environment, Barrett transcends the onesidedness" of Hoskyns who does not give sufficient weight to the non-biblical factors, and of Bultmann who goes to the opposite extreme. C. S. C. WILLIAMS in *JTS* 7 (2, '56) 282-284 considers "outstanding" B's notes on regeneration, Savior, dependence of the Son upon the Father, the Light of the world, the Good Shepherd, the question whether under the procurators the Jews could carry out the death penalty, the relation of the Church's commission to forgive sins, and baptism. J. N. SANDERS in *NTS* 3 (1, '56) 74-76 comments: "If the author neither solves, nor pretends to solve, all the problems with which this Gospel confronts the reader, he does at least perform the very considerable service of stating them fairly, and assembling in a convenient form the evidence (or most of it), of which any solution to the problems must take account." M.-E. BOISMARD in *RB* 63 (2, '56) 267-272 remarks that if B's book "... brings forward relatively little in the way of new materials for understanding Johannine thought, it gives evidence of outstanding balance of judgment in the choice of possible solutions." Boismard's review is thoroughly detailed, and represents a very sympathetic critique from the viewpoint of Catholic scholarship. A. VIARD in *RSPT* 40 (1, '56) 145-146 observes: "One of the merits of the commentary is that it has tried consistently to present a solution ... that takes account of all the elements." And he adds, "Perhaps B is at times too prudent, too reasonable?" The London Times reviewer in *TLitS* 55 (Jan. 13, '56) 25 suspects that, if pressed to draw up an order of preference regarding the place of writing of the Gospel, "... Mr. Barrett himself would prefer Ephesus—Antioch—Alexandria." M. ZERWICK in *VD* 34 (1, '56) 49-50 regrets that, with the exception of Lagrange, who is found in the bibliography, Catholic authors "seem to be in exile." But he concludes his review with an over-all commendation of B's book to the Catholic reader, taking exception only to a certain "... skepticism and minimism of the author in the question of the historical authority (not general, but particular) of the Fourth Gospel." R. G. in *Blackfriars* 37 (431, '56) 84-85 makes a number of rather summary criticisms. He finds that a complaint of E. Hoskyns, to wit, that the problem of authority has occupied too large, and the steady work of interpretation too small, a place in many recent Johannine studies, "... must be levelled against the work under review." W. GROSSOUW in *NovT* 1 (1, '56) 35-36 compares B's book favorably with those of Dodd and Bultmann on the Fourth Gospel. He notes, "It is somewhat surprising that Dodd and Barrett, reserved as they are in respect of the literary criticism of the Fourth Gospel, should rather emphatically have expressed the view that the author of I John ought to be distinguished from the Evangelist."

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

BOOK:

504r. E. STAUFFER, *New Testament Theology*, trans. J. Marsh (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1955, 25s; New York: Macmillan, 1955, \$4.25), 373 pp.

The preface asserts a double purpose: (1) to supply an introduction to NT thought to those who look to it on ultimate questions, and (2) to give the professional student a "workman's pass" to problems of NT research. The main portion presents a systematic introduction to NT thought. Some 800 notes plus extensive bibliographies provide the scholar's workshop.

OPINION:

505r. H. W. MONTEFIORE in *JTS* 7 (2, '56) 291-293 feels that insofar as the NT is susceptible to such systematic treatment the work is a magnificent achievement. Originality and erudition put it quite beyond the student world first intended. M welcomes the conclusion that the "history of religion in primitive Christianity is a history of theology from the beginning." There is, however, too much stress on NT unity without due emphasis on differences. Also, ascription of all five Johannine writings to the apostle John is unlikely to win general approval on the grounds presented. A. M. HUNTER in *ExpT* 67 (1, '55) 8-9 likewise demurs on John, and adds that the idea of Peter's primacy in the primitive Church will startle many Protestants. He praises Stauffer's freedom from Bultmann's skepticism. As for the translation, M finds a few lapses and H must grumble against "inconcinities." H considers this book a must for serious students. The *London Times* reviewer in *TLitS* 54 (Nov. 25, '55) 710 agrees. Both M and H regret bibliographical omissions of the best on the subject from British theologians. All three reviewers single out the author's erudition and competence. A. PIPER in *JBL* 75 (4, '56) 350-352 went on to call the book "rich and stimulating," and "an ideal textbook," but only after having taken several significant exceptions. He believes that the German original addressed itself with the NT answer of allegiance to Christ against the Caesar worship of neo-pagan National Socialism. The English translation awakens to a different climate. With M, P also scores the overemphasis on NT "oneness." Again, there is danger that by overdrawing historical perspective the NT will be "drowned in the relativity of history." P objects to the author's interpretation of the kerygma and to his exegetical method. Stauffer is too quick, too "apodictic," in settling controversies, and "too inclined to read his own Neo-Lutheranism into the NT." Finally, may not the author's oversimplifications tend to create in the student mind a distorted picture of the NT message?

BOOK:

506r. E. F. SUTCLIFFE, *Providence and Suffering in the Old and New Testaments* (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1955, 15s), viii and 175 pp.

Every religious system must give some answers to the problem of suffering,

especially the suffering of the undeserving. S presents a brief treatment of the ancient pagan solutions, and then turns to the Bible. His subsequent analyses expound the themes of the origin of suffering (as seen in Genesis), of corporate solidarity, of individual retribution, and of vicarious suffering.

OPINION:

507r. L. ALONSO-SCHÖKEL in *VD* 34 (3, '56) 181-182 sets the reviewers' pace by commenting that *Providence and Suffering*, while not pretending to be either profound or complete, eminently succeeds in the more limited goal of clear and sober exposition. The *London Times* reviewer in *TLitS* 55 (Jan. 13, '56) 25 says as much, and along with A-S has a good word for the author's erudition. A reviewer in *ExpT* 67 (5, '56) 140 judges the treatment "orthodox," and believes some elements will have special appeal for Roman Catholics. E. A. CERNY in *CBQ* 18 (2, '56) 181-182 and J. A. B. in *IrER* 86 (1, '56) 67-70 are more enthusiastic, both referring to the book as a "masterly" study. Favorable notice is given by H. WILLMERING in *HPR* 57 (4, '57) 380. On the other side of the ledger, S. B. FROST in *Theology* 59 (432, '56) 261 likes the idea of a "Roman Catholic scholar so intent on finding out what it is the Scriptures teach," but feels S's presentation does not come to grips with many big questions along the way. And H. J. RICHARDS in *Blackfriars* 37 (434, '56) 224 puts it all down as a "series of unrelated and rather mechanical analyses of some aspects of suffering in the OT," with too much of the Schools and a heavy-handed treatment of Genesis. This same section had been singled out for special praise by E. A. Cerny. Coming back again to Genesis, H. H. ROWLEY in *JTS* 7 (2, '56) 296-297 "is not persuaded that 'the origin of all the hardship and misery of the world is explained in Genesis.'" Could Adam's sin be the cause of earthquakes and the sufferings they entail? R commends Sutcliffe for a "wise penetration," especially in the OT parts, but offers this reservation: the Bible has a relevant message for only some of the aspects of pain, and these are the religiously significant, "but the Biblical theologian should not overcall his hand."

BOOK:

508r. G. B. VERITY, *Life in Christ: A Study of Coinherence* (Greenwich: Seabury Press, 1954, \$3.00), 224 pp.

The author directs this summary of biblical theology not to theologians but to ordinary laymen. Its general purpose is to show that regeneration, righteousness, eternal life, holiness, fellowship, and love are given and can be obtained and understood only by participation in Jesus Christ.

OPINION:

509r. M. BARTH in *JBL* 74 (3, '55) 206 agrees with V in general, but persists in the demand, "not to be fed with mysticism of any kind, but: 'Sir, we would see Jesus.'" M.-E. BOISMARD in *RB* 63 (1, '56) 145 thinks the book "simple but profound," but would like more space devoted to the scriptural texts concerning the Spirit of Christ. W. HAMILTON in *JR* 35 (3, '55) 187 feels the

work is "clear, interesting, and unusual," but parochial and limited, since so heavily Anglican in tone.

BOOK:

510r. T. PREISS, *Life in Christ*, trans. H. Knight, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 13 (Chicago: A. R. Allenson, Inc., 1954, \$1.50), 104 pp.

This book is a translation and a collection of five of P's thirteen essays on the NT. All stress the fundamental unity of the NT, which is to be found in various underlying themes. One key idea is that of juridical mysticism, access to God, not individually, but in a gigantic juridical context. P opposes both Bultmann and Dodd on their theories of eschatology.

OPINION:

511r. W. A. BEARDSLEE in *JR* 36 (1, '56) 60 is favorable in his review and regrets the untimely death of so fine a NT scholar. H. H. ROWLEY in *ExpT* 66 (4, '54-'55) 106 also laments the death of an author "who writes with insight and charm." E. P. BLAIR in *JBL* 75 (3, '56) 237 sees in P "a writer of unusual penetration, comprehensiveness, and religious insight."

THE BULTMANN DEBATE

BOOK:

512r. R. BULTMANN, *Theology of the New Testament, Vol. II*, trans. K. Grobel (New York: Scribners, 1955, \$4.00), 284 pp.

This second volume of Bultmann's *New Testament Theology* discusses the theology of St. John, the "Development toward the Ancient Church," the rise of Church order, the evolution of doctrine and the problem of Christian living. Bultmann, in an epilogue, offers his own view of the aims of NT theology.

OPINION:

513r. Short reviews have appeared in *CBQ* 18 (2, '56) 219 and in *JBL* 56 ('56) 352. A long editorial comment is found in *ExpT* 67 (4, '56) 97-98. The leader writer singles out B's Johannine section as the best work in the book. He agrees with B that John was familiar with the Synoptic tradition and not dependent upon Paul. But when B proceeds to discuss the themes in St. John, he finds him guilty of trimming the texts of whatever contradicts his own interpretation. In this "cavalier way" B excises John's references to the death of Jesus as expiation, to baptism as a sacrament, and to the events of the last day. We would not permit "a lesser scholar" such liberty—"B is our 20th century Marcion." The most serious complaint to be found is B's treatment of Jesus as the Revealer. For B has Jesus revealing nothing. This seems to be "a serious misrepresentation of a cardinal point" in John's theology. The review praises B's scholarship but adds, "we do not think it is a good theology of the NT."

BOOK:

514r. R. BULTMANN, *Essays Philosophical and Theological*, trans. J. C. G. Greig (London: S. C. M. Press, 1955, 21s.), 349 pp.

This translation of Bultmann's *Glauben und Verstehen*, a collection of essays written between 1931 and 1952, whose range includes the literary, historical, philosophical, and theological, has as its main theme the contrast between NT myth and the method of scientific history. This and the consequences flowing from it form the core of Bultmann's recent theological thought.

OPINION:

515r. The *London Times* reviewer in *TLS* 55 (Jan. 27, '56) 57 opens: "A more formidable analysis rarely roused ecclesiastical resistances." After a brief summary of B's historical outlook, the reviewer concedes that B "has a case" for representing his position as radical Protestantism. But he finds this weak spot in B's theory: it is impossible to distinguish between a mere *de facto* claim for Christ and a *de jure* claim of His objective mediation. The reviewer believes that here B's "mythicisim" turns against itself.

J. HENDERSON in *ExpT* 67 (6, '56) 169 finds the studies of this "exceptionally widely read man" provocative. J. Barnaby in *JTS* 7 (2, '56) 337 discusses B's idea of faith as a "never secure possession." Because for B faith is always an existential and momentary act, B advocates a "virtually Pelagian psychology." N. PERSICH in *CBQ* 18 (3, '56) 334 discovers but "one dominant theme," an existentialist description of human living. Because B portrays secular life and Christianity as irreconcilable, he must hold full Christian existence to be only "eschatological." Here P accuses B of being "arbitrary" and making "a distortion of historical facts, philosophical systems, theological concepts." P believes B's position irrefutable only because it springs from "a simple act of will."

516r. A. WILDER in *ChC* (April 11, '56) 457 considers B's treatment of the relation of the Bible to Greek thought just as important a contribution as his NT mythology. His greatest difficulty with B's thought is the "radical dichotomy between the old age and the new." On B's view Christian ethics becomes "a series of atomistic decisions" and "justification by faith has its most extreme expression." O. CLARKE in *Theology* 59 (430, '56) 166, while lauding B's clarity and breadth of learning, remarks sharply on "the lack of an adequate doctrine of the Church throughout these essays." The defects of our institutions cannot excuse Christians from active participation "in the politics both of the world and the visible Church." He concludes: "For Bultmann's challenge we must be grateful, but we need a yet broader one."

BOOK:

517r. *Kerygma and Myth*, "A Theological Debate," ed. H. W. Bartsch, trans. R. H. Fuller (London: S.P.C.K. 1953, \$4.50) 235 pp.

This is a collection of essays debating R. Bultmann's theory of kerygma and myth in the NT. The collection is compiled from vol. 1 of the two-volume work *Kerygma und Mythos*. It is "statements, replies and counter-replies" by Bultmann and other scholars. An essay of appreciation for English readers by A. Farrer is added to this translation.

OPINION:

518r. Reviews agree that one of Bultmann's clearest expositions of "kerygma" and "myth" is found here. But reviewers of different confessions regard his interpretation of NT "myth" in terms of existential philosophy as extreme. H. H. ROWLEY in *ExpT* 67 (9, '56) 286 thinks that B "throws out the baby with the bath water" in trying to present the NT to modern readers. L. BUSHINSKI in *CBQ* 18 (1, '56) 107 sees in B's theory the "logical development of the principles of the *Formgeschichte* school." He agrees with Schniewind's criticism that there is difficulty in classifying "kerygma matter" from myth. R. A. DYSON in *VD* 33 (1, '55) 62 notes "with surprise" that Bultmann has nothing to say of the Incarnation. He thinks that B should consider the difference between analogous and "mythical" knowledge of God. Reviews of the original German work may be found in *Irénikon* 29 (3, '56) 338 and in *Theology* 58 (417, '55) 107.

BOOK:

519r. F. GOGARTEN, *Demythologizing and History*, trans. N. Smith (New York: Scribners, 1955, \$2.50) 92 pp.

Bultmann's views on mythology and the NT are studied in the light of official church reactions in Germany. G believes that the concept of history is biblical rather than Greek in origin, but that the Christian creeds wrongly connected it with metaphysics. Bultmann's use of existentialism avoids this false subject-object pattern.

OPINION:

520r. J. MACQUARRIE in *ExpT* 66 (9, '55) 352 gives an exposition of G's concept of history and remarks: "if Gogarten is right, it delivers us from a mistaken understanding of the historical, and brings to light the genuine historical nature of the Christian religion." M wishes, however, that G had developed further his claim that this view of history found in Heidegger is also "inherent in the NT." R. LEANEY in *Theology* 58 (420, '55) 234 observes that each side in the demythologizing controversy interprets "history" in his own sense. He feels that, "We still need an adequate account from this school of the fact that NT presents the Incarnation as an entering into history *in the old sense*."

521r. W. LEIBRECHT in *ChC* 73 (Feb. 15, '56) 209 calls G's work "the best book in English on this controversy." He sees G identifying himself completely with the principles of demythologizing. Because G rejects any metaphysical interpretation of the faith as impossible, he is "forced to dissolve the objective character of the world as well as of history." Furthermore, what G calls "historical interpretation" is nothing other than "existential interpretation"; and "historical no longer means historical." Finally, he points up the similarity between G and Kant on the meaning of religion and human nature.

522r. D. E. WHITELEY in *JTS* 7 (2, '56) 336 thinks that it is difficult "to square" G's *apologia* with some of Bultmann's own views. He believes that G

must answer some further questions before judgment may be passed on his theory. F. W. F. in *JBL* 75 (4, '56) 352 finds some confusion in G's own idea of historical study. B. GRIFFITHS in *Blackfriars* 36 (429, '55) 504, while admiring G's "profound conception" of man as essentially historical, feels "it is a pity that he finds it necessary to reject not merely the dualism of Descartes, but also the whole metaphysical system of Christian thought."

BOOK:

523r. L. MALEVEZ, *Le message chrétien et le mythe* (Bruges-Paris: Descleé de Brouwer, 1954, 80 BFr.), 169 pp.

This full-dress criticism of Bultmann's theology from a Catholic standpoint carefully and with great sympathy considers both demythologizing and Bultmann's use of Heidegger's philosophy. It is, of course, critical of many of Bultmann's conclusions. It rejects most of his accusations of myth, and finds them postulated on an outmoded rationalism. At the same time, it seeks to exculpate Bultmann from the easiest and most common charge made against him, that of being, because existentialist, subjective.

OPINION:

524r. The reviewers unanimously express their delight (and in some cases, surprise) at Malevez' painstaking fairness to his opponent. Thus R. FULLER, whose review in *Theology* 58 (417, '55) 107 is the only notice taken of the book by a Protestant reviewer as far as we could find, says handsomely, "I know of no clearer and more impartial study of Bultmann's theology: it is written *sine ira et studio* to a degree which is really remarkable, and compares favourably with anything written on the critical side, whether in this country or on the continent." Praise for Malevez' objectivity is the burden also of X. LEON-DUFOUR's short review in *Etudes* 286 ('55) 261. But while they do praise M's objectivity, most of the Catholic reviewers would seem to have preferred a more vigorous refutation on one or another point. P. Nöber in *Biblica* 37 (1, '56) 115 believes that Malevez should have questioned further Bultmann's concept of personality in God, although he agrees with J. HONORE in *RScRel* 31 (1, '57) 86 in favoring M's attempt to acquit Bultmann of the accusation of subjectivistic thinking. C. SPICQ in *FZPT* 3 (4, '56) 445 takes the occasion of his short review to lash out at Bultmann. He, too, praises Malevez' objectivity, but with Spicq one feels that objectivity has become excessive forbearance, if not, indeed, connivance. For "the religious devaluation of the gospel is far too serious for one to consider *Entmythologisierung* as just any sort of philosophical *questio*." Bultmann "... aims at nothing less than the destruction of the supernatural and of traditional Christian faith; so much so his proposals can be called Gnosticism and the resurgence of Docetism." (For this last statement Spicq cites Cullmann.) G. MATHON in *MSR* 13 (1, '56) 121 is more dispassionate, since the greater part of his lengthy review is occupied with a noncommittal summary of Malevez; yet one receives an impression that he is somewhat more definitely disapproving of Bultmann than the book he is review-

ing: thus, for instance this aside, “. . . (Bultmann’s thought) is rendered more difficult still by the use and abuse of those neologisms, so dear to Trans-Rhenish thought.” Nor is M, any more than P. BENOIT in *RB* 63 (2, ’56) 299, convinced by Malevez’ opting for an objective interpretation of Bultmann’s thought. Both men remark that B is simply unclear on the point, and Benoit thinks that Malevez derives his interpretation from Gogarten. Benoit’s not overlong review is yet very meaty: he finds the book’s most valuable contributions precisely in those sections where it manages some measure of *rapprochement* between Catholic thought and Bultmann’s; the criticism of Bultmann’s rationalism is telling, but might have been more so, had its root fault, its idealistic hatred of the flesh, come in for more emphasis; for it is this which sets Bultmann unalterably against the full Christian message: the treatment of B’s Lutheran and existentialist biases was “less vigorous and less effective.” At the same time Benoit states that this is the best and most complete essay on Bultmann’s theology: he hopes for the appearance soon of one on his exegetical methods. A. Cossement takes brief notice of the book in *RUO* 26 (1, ’56) 59*. He also seems unconvinced by Malevez’ objective interpretation of Bultmann.

ADDENDA

(The following items were prepared by Prof. Dr. J. Blinzler and W. Kuchler of Passau.)

525r. K. STAAB, *Das Evangelium nach Markus und Lukas*. (Würzburg: Echter, 1956). Rev. by J. Blinzler, *Klerusblatt* 36 (’56) 121-122.

The early date for the two Gospels (Mk end of 50, Lk before 63) which S advocates is doubtful. Would not the anti-Marcionite prologue and even Papias attest or at least presuppose the death of Peter at the time of the composition of Mk? On the other hand S’s position on the following verses should be accepted: Mk 7:17; 10:15; 14:55 ff.; 15:1; 16:9-20; Lk 1:34; 7:37; 11:5 ff.; 18:1 ff.; 13:33; 17:11; 16:9.21-23.24; 22:44; 23:53.—W. K.

526r. M. SAPONARO, *Jesus* (Illingen, no date). Rev. by J. Blinzler, *Klerusblatt* 37 (’57) 62-63.

By weaving together psychological character description and colorful pictures from nature the person and the work of the divine Redeemer are not clarified but rather obscured.—W. K.

527r. J. GNILKA, *Ist 1 Kor 3, 10-15 ein Schriftzeugnis für das Fegfeuer?* (Düsseldorf: Tritsch, 1955). Rev. by J. Kürzinger, *Klerusblatt* 36 (’56) 173.

G correctly answers his query in the negative. It is another matter to say that he has explained every detail of this complicated text.—J. Bz.

- 528r. K. SCHUBERT, *Die Religion des nachbiblischen Judentums* (Freiburg: Herder, 1955). Rev. by J. Blinzler, *Klerusblatt* 36 ('56) 153.

The book is exceptionally valuable. Num 11:16 (Mishnah, Sanh 1, 6), Josephus, *Bell Jud.* 4, 334 ff.; 2, 571; 2, 482; *Vita* 56 are cited against Schubert who doubted that at the time of Jesus the Sanhedrin consisted of 70 members in addition to the high priest.—W. K.

- 529r. J. BLINZLER, *Der Prozess Jesu*. 2nd ed. (Regensburg: Pustet, 1955). Rev. by J. Kürzinger, *Klerusblatt* 35 ('56) 426.

Anyone who wishes information about the variety of questions which concern the trial of Jesus will find in this book reliable answers which have been very carefully worked out. Furthermore on controverted points the reader is presented with ample evidence so that he may form his own opinion.—W. K.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

BLINZLER—Joseph Blinzler was born July 7, 1910 in Stockheim (Oberfranken) Germany and studied at the classical Gymnasium in Dilligen and the University of Munich where he obtained the degree of doctor of theology. As a diocesan priest he was engaged from 1939-49 in parochial work at Hilgertshausen near Dachau. Specializing in NT exegesis he became NT *Privatdozent* at the University of Munich (1947-49) and later Professor of the NT at the diocesan seminary in Passau. His book *Der Prozess Jesu* has appeared in a second German edition and will be published this year in English translation by the Newman Press.

CERFAUX—Bishop Lucien Cerfaux was born in Presles, Belgium, on June 14, 1883. Ordained a priest of the diocese of Tournai, he completed his graduate studies in theology at the Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome. In 1928 he became a Lecturer in Sacred Scripture at the Catholic University of Louvain, advancing to Professor in 1930, and becoming Professor Emeritus in 1953. A two-volume collection of his studies in exegesis and the history of religion (*Recueil Lucien Cerfaux*) was published in 1954. This work also contains a 105-entry bibliography of his books and articles since 1922. Listed in addition to this are 82 licentiate or doctoral dissertations, written under his direction from 1932 to 1954. In 1956 he published a second edition of his *La voix vivante de l'Évangile au début de l'Église*, the first edition of which was translated into German in 1953. Other works of recent years include *Les Actes des Apôtres*, and *La communauté apostolique* (1953), and the section on Luke in the Supplement of the *Dictionnaire de la Bible*.

GOODSPEED—Edgar Johnson Goodspeed, a member of the American Baptist Convention, was born in Quincy, Illinois, on October 23, 1871. He has received degrees from Denison University (A.B., D.D., LL.D.), University of Chicago (D.B., Ph.D.), University of Redlands (L.H.D.), Yale (D.D.), and California (LL.D.). From 1893 to 1937 he held various positions on the faculty of the University of Chicago and was chairman of the NT department (1923-37). In 1919 he was President of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis. Since 1902, his works have concerned patristics, Greek paleography, papyrography and textual criticism. A voluminous writer, he is perhaps best known for his translations of the New Testament and the Apocrypha. His more recent publications include *The Key to Ephesians*, and *Modern Apocrypha* (1956), and *The Twelve* (1957). At present he is the Ernest Dewitt Burton Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus of Biblical and Patristic Greek, of the University of Chicago.

GRANT—Frederick Clifton Grant, D.D., Th.D., L.H.D., D.C.L., D.S. Litt., was born at Beloit, Wisconsin, Feb. 2, 1891. He studied at Lawrence College, Nashotah House, General Theological Seminary, Western Theological Semi-

nary, Kenyon College and Bishop's University, Quebec. After holding the posts of Dean of Bexley Hall, Kenyon College (1924-26) and President of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary (1927-38) he came to Union Theological Seminary, New York, where he has been since 1938 Professor of Biblical Theology. An ordained priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church, he was editor in chief of the *Anglican Theological Review* (1924-55) and since 1937 a member of the Revised Standard Bible Commission. He has specialized in the Gospels and the Jewish and Greco-Roman background of the New Testament. Among his recent publications are *The Gospels, Their Origin and Their Growth* (1957) and *Ancient Roman Religion* (1957). With H. H. Rowley he is co-editor of the new edition of Hastings one volume Bible Dictionary which is scheduled to appear in 1959-60.

GRAYSTONE—Geoffrey Graystone, S.M., D.D., was born at Hull, England, July 22, 1922. After studies at London University (First Arts) and the Marist seminaries at Dublin and Paignton he attended St. Patrick's College, Maynooth (1946-48; S.T.D.) and the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome (1955-56). Previously a teacher in the Marist Houses of Studies at Paignton (1948-49) and Dublin (1949-55), he is at present Professor of Scripture and Moral Theology at Paignton, England. He specializes in the Synoptic Gospels and has recently published *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ* (1956).

JONES—Alexander Jones was born in Liverpool, England, on August 12, 1906. He studied at the Venerable English College, Rome, where he was ordained for the Archdiocese of Liverpool, and continued his studies at the Pontifical Gregorian University (S.T.L., B.C.L.), and the Pontifical Biblical Institute (S.S.L.). Since 1936 he has been Professor of Hebrew and Sacred Scripture at Upholland College, Lancashire, England. A frequent contributor to *Scripture* and other periodicals, he has also published *Kingdom of Promise* (with R. A. Dyson, S.J., 1947), *Unless Some Man Show Me* (1951), a commentary on Matthew in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (1953), and will soon publish a commentary on Mark.

METZGER—Bruce M. Metzger, Presbyterian minister, was born in Middletown, Pennsylvania, on February 9, 1914. His studies were made at Lebanon Valley College (A.B., hon. D.D.), Princeton University (A.M., Ph.D., classics), and Princeton Theological Seminary (Th. B., Th. M.). Since his graduation from the Seminary in 1938, he has been engaged there as Professor of New Testament Language and Literature. An expert in textual criticism, he has published widely in this field. His more recent works are *An Annotated Bibliography of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (1955), and *The Text, Canon, and Principal Versions of the Bible* (with E. E. Flack, 1956). He was the New Testament editor of the *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (1955). At present he is Editorial Secretary of *Theology*

Today, and a member of the Revised Standard Version committee revising the translation of the Apocrypha, to be published in September.

STEINMUELLER—Monsignor John Emil Steinmueller was born in Brooklyn, New York, on December 5, 1899. His studies were made at St. John's Seminary, Brooklyn, and at the University of Innsbruck, Austria, where he was ordained a priest in 1924. Graduate studies in Theology followed in Rome, at the Lateran University (S.T.D., 1925), and at the Pontifical Biblical Institute (S.S.L., 1928). From 1928 to 1950 he was Professor of Sacred Scripture at Immaculate Conception Seminary, Huntington, Long Island, where he published notably, *A Companion to Scripture Studies* (3 vols: 1941 to 1943), and *A Gospel Harmony* (1942). With the assistance of Mother Kathryn Sullivan, R.S.C.J. he edited the *Catholic Biblical Encyclopedia* (1956). He has contributed to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. At present he is a Consultor to the Pontifical Biblical Commission, and is the pastor of St. Barbara's Parish, Brooklyn.

STENDAHL—Krister Stendahl (B.D., Th. D.) was born April 21, 1921 in Stockholm and studied at Uppsala University, Cambridge University and Paris. Appointed *docent* at Uppsala University he came in 1954 to Harvard where he is now Associate Professor. An ordained priest of the Church of Sweden, he has done parochial work, been chaplain to the students at Uppsala and was President of the Swedish Student Christian Movement. Under the auspices of the U.S. National Lutheran Council he visited colleges and universities in this country in preparation for the General Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation in Hanover, Germany 1952. Among his recent works are *The School of St. Matthew* (1954) and *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed.; Harpers, 1957).

WILDER—Amos Niven Wilder, Congregational minister, exegete, and poet, was born in Madison, Wisconsin, on September 18, 1895. He served in France during World War I with the American Ambulance Field Service, and was awarded the Croix de Guerre. Later he studied at Yale (B.A., B.D., Ph.D., D.D.), Mansfield College (Oxford), and the University of Brussels. Ordained in 1926, he devoted several years to the ministry in North Conway, New Hampshire. For different periods since 1930, he has held professorships at Hamilton College, Andover Newton Theological School, Chicago Theological Seminary, the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago, and the University of Frankfurt, Germany. His poetical works include *Battle Retrospect and Other Poems* (1923), *Arachne* (1928), *Spiritual Aspects of the New Poetry* (1940), and *The Healing of the Waters* (1943). At present he is Hollis Professor of Divinity at the Harvard Divinity School. In 1955 he was President of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, and in that year published *New Testament Faith for Today*. He has written the commentary on the Johannine Epistles for the forthcoming Volume 12 of *The Interpreter's Bible*.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Biblische Zeitschrift, New Series (1, '57), ed. V. Hamp and R. Schnackenburg. Published by Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, Germany. Price: DM 15 an issue. Annual subscription: DM 30, for two issues.

L. Cerfaux, *La voix vivante de l'Évangile au début de l'Église*, Bible et Vie chrétienne (2nd ed., Tournai: Casterman, 1956, 480 fr. fr.-69 fr. b.), 160 pp.

G. A. Hadjiantoniou, *New Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1957, \$4.50), 352 pp.

Logos: Periodicum Theologiae Trimestre 7 (3, '56), ed. and pbl. by the Redemptorist Fathers of the Eastern Rite, Yorkton, Sask., Canada. Yearly subscription: \$5.00; single subscription: \$1.23. (Pbl. in Russian).

Supplementum Homileticum Ad Logos 7 (3, '56).

B. M. Metzger, "New Light From Old Manuscripts," *Theology Today* 13 (1, '56) 72-86.

B. M. Metzger, "Precious Pages," *The Living Church* (Feb. 24, '57) 9-11.

Studies in Bibliography and Booklore 2 (4, '56), pbl. by the Library of Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio. Subscription: \$4.00 a volume; single numbers, \$1.25.

EDITORIAL NOTICE

In this, the last issue of Volume One, we, the Editors of NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS, wish to express our gratitude for all the helpful advice and encouragement sent to us during the course of the past year of publication. We have tried to follow the many helpful suggestions and to supply the extra services requested. The swift and steady rise in circulation has given us the comforting realization that we are supplying at least some of the services that our readers desire.

In our next issue, to appear in November of 1957, we will be starting our second volume. In this volume we hope to extend our coverage and to supply several additional services in coordinating and presenting New Testament information. If our readers have any further requests or suggestions, we will be most interested in hearing from them.

CUMULATIVE SCRIPTURE INDEX — VOLUME I

Genesis		Psalms		Matthew	
1:20ff	82	32:6	242	1:18-25	204
3:15	101, 682	105:20	82	1:18-2:12	235
3:17	122	110	188	2:2	392
6:9	426	118	237	2:7	392
17:1	426	Proverbs		3:11	143, 144, 397
20:5	426	3:19	90	4:5	175
49:10	463	7:22	90	5	391
Exodus		8:30	90	5:3	428
3:4	378	Wisdom of Solomon		5:8	234
5:3ff	423	1:7	90	5:17-18	449
12:9	184	7:21	90	5:21-22	391
24	229	7:26	90	5:25-26	31
24:8	118r	18:14ff	235	5:27	234
34:6	424	Ben Sira		5:32	39
34:28	242	1:7	90	5:38	233
Leviticus		34, 35	258	5:39-40	25, 180, 388
18:22	464	Isaiah		6:1-18	391
20:13	464	6:1-10	395	6:1-6	234
23:5	184	6:9-10	34	6:21, 22	426
Numbers		10-11	463	6:22	234
11:16	528r	26:4	276	7:3	233
24:15-17	463	26:29	42	7:12	233
Deuteronomy		42	118r	8:11-12	388
4:15-18	82	42:1	138r	10:1-2	113
5:28-29	463	42:4	395	10:5	113
18:15	415	43:10	378	10:18	45
18:18	296r	46:4	378	11:2ff	410
18:18-19	463	50:6-8	388	11:11	67
24:1	39	52:13ff	171r	11:14	207
32:39	378	53	118r, 280r, 415	11:27	378, 389
33:8-11	463	63:11	43	12:7	233
Joshua		63:19	43	12:31-32	228
6:26	463	Jeremiah		12:46-50	200
15:55	454	2:11	82	13	391
15:61-62	461	31:7-20	51	13:11	34
19:34	454	31:33	118r	13:19	388
21:16	454	Ezekiel		13:38	388
Ruth		11:22	462	14:20	281
2:14	281	37	42	14:27	378
3:9	281	Daniel		15:18	234
1 Kings		7:13	171r, 188, 393	16:16	174, 389
9:4	426	8:13	35	16:17-19	393
1 Chronicles		12:1-3	42	16:18	21
29:17	426	Zechariah		16:21-17:22	393
2 Chronicles		6:12	176	17:11-13	207
26:10	467	9:9	463	18:8-14	51
30:24	464	14:7	176	18:11	21
Job		14:4	462	18:15	35, 233
11:8	90	Malachi		19:4	281
19:25	42	1:2	420	19:9	39, 234
28	90	1 Maccabees		19:18	112
28:24-27	90	9:5	475	22:2-9	368
				22:15-46	281
				22:37ff	438
				23:9	313r
				24:11	420

Matthew		Luke		John	
24:14	45	5:39	397	3:36	21
24:22	424	6:13	182	4	405
25:22ff	264	7:19	385	4:1-12	193
25:35	233	7:36-50	397	5:4	177
26:31-32	376	8:2	206	5:17	401
26:38, 45	281	9:51-18:14	296r	5:25-28	42
27:52	42	10:22	389	6	194
27:59	380	10:27	426	6:16-20	294r
27:62-65	376	10:30ff	233	6:21	378
28:8-10	294r	11:2-4	49	7-8	237
28:16-20	294r	11:37-54	426	7:2	237
28:16	221	11:39	234	7:19	449
28:18-19	144	11:41	234	7:41-42	206
28:19-20	21	12:10	228	7:53-8:11	177, 181
Mark		12:32	447	8:24, 28	378
1:4	144	12:50	144	8:41	206
1:7	379	12:58	31	8:44, 51	112
3:6	31	13:1-8	31	8:57ff	378
3:22-30	228	13:22-30	50	9:1ff	144
4:10-12	27r, 395	14:6	397	9:29	206
4:11	34	14:16-24	50	10	447
6:1-32	113	15	51	10:1-18	404
6:3	206	16:9-13	52	10:8	31
6:34ff	44	17:25	393	10:23	414
6:51	378	18:9	234	12:1-11	64
7:20	234	20:18-35	116	13-17	63r
7:25	172	21-24	192	13:1-20	41
8:27-10:45	394	22:7	184	13:10	234
8:38	188	22:19b-20	21	15:3	234
10:38	144	22:57	189	15:13	233, 403
11:25	314r	22:60	189	17	41
12:17	234	23:49	376	17:21	442
12:28	233	23:53	380	18:28	257
13	107r, 314r	24:13-35	294r	18:32	181
13:9-11	304r	24:19ff	116	19:25-27	57, 201
13:10	45	24:25-27	415	19:36	281
13:26	188	24:26	393	19:39	380
14:12	184	24:34	294r	20:5-7	380
14:55-65	181	24:36, 39	378	20:19-21	294r
14:62	188	24:44-46	415	20:19	376
14:68	189	John		20:30	195
15:46	380	1-14	177	21:1-14	294r
16:1	380	1:1-14	177	Acts	
16:9-20	21	1:3-4	62	1-15	416
Luke		1:3	197, 472	2:27-29	42
1-2	47, 191, 192	1:4	60	2:36	211
1:1-4	116	1:12-13	206	3:11	414
1:26-56	235	1:17	449	3:17	418
1:26-38	204	1:19-51	56	3:18	211
1:34-35	202, 206	1:26-27	144	3:27	418
1:34	398	1:27	379	6:8-7:60	181
1:35	281	1:29-34	402	7:51-53	449
1:36	398	2:1-12	405	10	225
1:80	46	2:1-11	64	10:38-40	118r
2:1-20	235	2:13-22	382	11:28-30	368
3:16	379	3:5-6	112	11:30	225
5:1-11	294r	3:5	143, 144	12:25	225, 368

Acts		2 Corinthians		2 Timothy	
13:46	420	5:1-10	86, 224	1:10	227
14:10-11	209	8-9	426	1:17	217
15	491r	11:3	426	2:20-21	420
18	209	12:4	85r	4:6-8	94
19:22	94	13:13	106r	4:16	217
21:8-9	206	13:18	72		
22:1-21	210	Galatians		Titus	
24:26	217	1:15-17	210	1:4-6,7-9	95
26:12-19	210	1:19	125	2:11	235
28:30-31	217	2-4	238	2:12-14	97
Romans		2	491r	3:4-7	97
1-8	83	2:1ff	225	3:4	235
1:9-10	76	2:6	65	3:5	21
1:23	82	2:9	65	Hebrews	
5:12	215	2:11-21	65	4:12-13	96r
6:3-5	144	2:17-19	88	5:7	96r
8:3-4	449	2:20	21	7:3	206
8:7	21	3:10	449	7:14-15	465
8:15	21	3:24	6r	9:23	96r
9-11	81	3:27	143, 144	10:5-7	235
9:13	420	4:4	206	10:19	258
9:22	420	5:10ff	472	11:11	96r
11:33-34	90	5:16-17	472	11:39-40	42
12:3-8	92r	6:13	219	12:30	43
13:1-7	123r	Ephesians		13	447
13:9	21	1:23	90	13:8	110
15:16	76	2:20, 21	417	1 Peter	97
16:7	125	3:18	90	1:3-3:16	97
16:19	264	4:8	42	1:3-5	97
1 Corinthians		5:27	21	1:13-2:10	97, 423
1:2-9	220	6:5	426	1:13ff	97
2:6	84	6:10	417	1:19	131
2:8	223, 418	6:12	422	2:4-9	258
2:16	417	Philippians		2:5-4	258
3:10-15	527r	1:6	21	2:9	351r
3:11	417	2:6-11	213	2:49	258
5:5-7	294r	2:19	94	3:18-20	98
7:6	3r	2:5-8	21	3:19	42
7:36-38	215	4:1	417	4:6	98
8:10	315r	Colossians		5	447
10, 11	84	1:15-20	213	2 Peter	
10:1-4	449	1:17-19	90	1:16	250
11:24	184	1:24	92r	1 John	
12:12-26	92r	2:9-10	90	2:3-5	99r
12:21	417	2:15	418	3:1-11	97
15	86, 264	3:1-4:6	97	3:4	230
15:4-5	294r	3:12	426	Apocalypse	
15:5	448	2 Thessalonians		1:5	42
15:21-27	106r	2:3ff	424	1:6	258
15:29	222	2:6ff	419r	12	101, 201, 235
15:38	417	1 Timothy		13	123r
16:22	421	1:17	227	20:1-6	424
2 Corinthians		2:8	21	20:4-6	106r
1:8	73r	3:2	21	20:6	258
1:18ff	450	3:16	213, 235	21-22	237
3:7-11	72				

CUMULATIVE AUTHOR INDEX — VOLUME I

SIGLA

- (A) Author, editor or translator of article or book
- (B) Book reviewer
- (C) Cited in article or book review
- (Biog. p. 158) Biographical Notes p. 158

- Abel, F. M.: 172(C), 455(C), 462(C)
Adamantius: 197(C)
Adler, N.: 156(A)
Agabus: 368(C)
Agrippa: 181(C)
Aharoni: 461(C)
Aland, Kurt: 65(A)
Albertz, M.: 106r(A)
Albright, William: 107r(C), 126(C), 159(A), 169(C), 454(C)
Alexander Jannaeus: 269(C), 275(C), 278(C), 467(C)
Alfaric, P.: 163(C)
Alford: 221(C)
Allegro, John M.: 157(A), 167(C), 169(C), 266(C), 268(C), 275(C), 283r-292r(A), 463(A), 475(C)
Alonso-Schökel, L.: 507r(B)
Ambrose, St.: 42(C), 197(C), 407(C)
Antiochus Epiphanes: 275(C)
Aquinas, St. Thomas: see "Thomas"
Argyle, A. W.: 22(A), 25(C), 180(A), 388(C), 406(C)
Aristotle: 338r(C)
Arnaldich, L.: 1(A)
Arndt, W.: 88(A), 225(A)
Athanasius, St.: 42(C), 246(C), 407(C)
Audet, J. P.: 203(A)
Augustine, St.: 42(C), 128r(C), 365(C), 420(C)
Aulen, Gustave: 245(A), 246(A),
de Ausejo, S.: 400(A), 500r(B)
Avigad, N.: 461(C)
Avi-Yonah, M.: 452(A), 455(C)
Ayuso, T.: 19(C), 332r(C)
- Bacht, H.: 354r(B), 426(A), 427(A)
Baer, I.: 478(A)
Bagatti, B.: 453(A), 461(C)
Baillet, M.: 265(A), 464(A)
Baker, H. W.: 469(C)
Baker, J.: 397(A)
Baldi, D.: 454(A)
Baltowski: 376(A)
Bammel, F.: 140r(A)
Baracaldo, R.: 72(A)
Barnabas, Epistle of: 441(C), 472(C)
Barnaby, J.: 515r(B)
Baron, D.: 172(C)
Barrera, L.: 213(A)
Barrett, C. K.: 53r(A), 57(C), 193(C), 346r(B), 510r(A)
Barth, Karl: 120r(C), 150(C), 206(C), 236(C), 246(C), 367(C), 372(C)
Barth, M.: 509r(B),
Barthélemy, D.: 44(C), 272(C), 276(C)
Bartling, V.: 28r(B), 69r(B), 73r(B), 100r(B)
Barton, J. M. T.: 362r(B)
Bartsch, H. W.: 517r(A)
Battifol, P.: 113(C)
Bauer, G. B.: 193(C)
Bauer, J. B.: 40(A)
Bauer, W.: 9r(A)
Baumgärtel, F.: 366(C)
Baumgarten: 473(C)
Baumstark, A.: 37(A)
Baur, F. C.: 125(C), 491r(C)
- Bea, A.: 151(A), 232(A)
Beardslee, W. A.: 511r(B)
Beare, F. W.: 347r(B)
Beasley-Murray, G.: 108r(A), 315r-318r(A)
Beaucamp, E.: 220(A)
Beaupère, R.: 348r-352r(A)
Beauvery, R.: 455(A)
Bellarmine, St. Robert: 59(C)
Bellemare, R.: 428(A)
Benoit, Pierre: 7r(A), 10r(B), 12r(B), 15r(B), 66r(B), 89(A), 91r(B), 92r(B), 119r(B), 120r(B), 148r(B), 174(A), 215(C), 257(A), 495r(B), 524r(B)
Bentzen, A.: 127(C)
Benveniste, E.: 363(A)
Bernard, J. H.: 53r(C), 501r(C)
Bernard of Clairvaux, St.: 42(C)
Bernardine of Siena, St.: 42(C), 59(C)
Bertram, G.: 122(C)
Best, E.: 417(A), 496r(A)
Birdsall, J.: 19(A)
Birnbaum, S. A.: 263(A)
Bishop, E. F. F.: 221(A)
Black, M.: 6r(A), 22(C), 189(C), 320r(B)
Blair, E. P.: 511r(B)
Blank, S.: 126(C)
Blinzler, Josef: (Biog. p. 237), 380(C), 525r(B), 526r(B), 528r(B), 529r(A)
Bloch, J.: 172(A)
Böhl, F.: 126(C)
Bogle, M. M.: 84(A)
Boismard, M. E.: 3r(B), 4r(B), 5r(B), 7r(B), 9r(B), 27r(B), 30r(B), 53r(B), 71r(B), 96r(B), 97(A), 99r(B), 106r(B), 111r(B), 115r(B), 118r(B), 121r(B), 123r(B), 124r(B), 138r(B), 139r(B), 171r(B), 254(A), 316r(B), 321r(B), 329r(B), 333r(B), 338r(B), 358r(B), 423(A), 500r(B), 503r(B), 509r(B)
Bonaventure, St.: 42(C)
Bonsirven, J.: (Biog p. 158), 39(C), 99r(A), 107r(A), 172(C), 213(C), 233(A), 234(A), 498r(A), 499r(B)
Bornkamm, J.: 366(C)
Bossuet: 59(C)
Bouman, H.: 102r(B), 377(A)
Bouquet, A.: 173r(A)
Bourke, J.: 493r(B)
Bouyer, Louis: 193(C)
Bover: 213(C)
Bowman, J.: 172(C)
Boyd, W. J. P.: 189(A), 418(A)
Boyer, D.: 214(A)
Bratcher, R. G.: 190(A)
Braun, F. M.: 54(A), 101(A), 163(C), 193(C), 199(C), 201(C), 380(C), 399(A)
Braun, M.: 279(A)
Brilioth, Y.: 140r(C)
Brinktrine, J.: 378(A)
Brockington, L. H.: 293r(B)
Brown, Raymond E.: 10r(A), 11r(A), 193(C), 290r(B), 359r-362r(A), 465(A), 500r(B)
Brownlee, W.: 172(C), 271(C), 276(C)
Bruce, F.: 69r(A)
Brucker: 436(C)
Brunner, E.: 206(C)
Brunotte, H.: 353r-355r(A)

- Bruns, J. Edgar: 280(A)
 Buchanan, G. W.: 187(A)
 Buchheit, G.: 66r(A)
 Budde, K.: 126(C)
 Buhl: 464(C)
 Bullough, S.: 2(A)
 Bultmann, Rudolf K.: (Biog. p. 158), 3r(C), 12r(A), 26r(C), 35(C), 57(C), 118r(C), 145(C), 146(C), 147(C), 148r(C), 149(C), 245(C), 246(C), 366(C), 393(C), 399(C), 427(C), 451(C), 485r(C), 495r(C), 503r(C), 505r(C), 510r(C), 512r-524r(A)
 Bundy, Walter E.: 484r(A)
 Burkill, T. A.: 181(A)
 Burrows, Millar: 127(C), 276(C), 283r-292r(A)
 Buse, I.: 43(A)
 Bushinski, L.: 518r(B)
 Busink, T.: 154r(B)
 Van den Bussche, H.: 61(A), 62(A), 63r(A), 196(A), 349r(B)
 Butler, C.: 295r(B), 299r(B), 305r(B), 306r(B), 308r(B), 310r(B), 314r(B)
 Cabaniss, A.: 235(A)
 Cadbury, Edward: 346r-347r(C)
 Cadbury, Henry J.: 209(C)
 Caird, G. B.: 23(A)
 Cajetan: 202(C)
 Caligula: 181(C)
 Calvin: 420(C)
 Cambier, J.: 193(C)
 Cambron, M.: 102r(A)
 Carcopino, Jerome: 458(C)
 Carmignac, J.: 466(A)
 Carpocrates: 412(C)
 Carrington, P.: 237(C)
 Carroll, E. R.: 407(A)
 Cassian, Bishop: 429(A)
 Celier, P.: 114r(A)
 Cerfaux, Lucien: (Biog. p. 237), 34(A), 101(C), 109r(A), 113(C), 185(C), 193(C), 213(C), 299r(C)
 Cerny, E. A.: 507r(B)
 Chadwick, H.: 176(A)
 Chamberlain: 473(C)
 Charlier, Celestin: 55(A), 193(C)
 Chrysostom, St. John: 42(C), 329r(C)
 Ciappi, L.: 110(A)
 Clarke, O.: 516r(B)
 Clavier, H.: 24(A)
 Clement of Alexandria: 36(C), 441(C)
 Clement of Rome, St.: 74(C), 481(C)
 Clermont-Ganneau: 181(C)
 Collins, John J.: 215(A), 285r(B)
 Colunga, A.: 424(A)
 Colwell, E.: 331r-332r(A)
 Considine, T.: 390(A)
 Conybeare: 178(C)
 Coppens, J.: 11r(C), 109r(A), 127(C), 156(C), 170r(B), 174(C), 216(A), 366(C)
 Corbato: 412(C)
 Corish, P.: 259(A)
 Corwin, Alsoph: 159(C)
 Cossement, A.: 524r(B)
 de Couesnongle, V.: 431(A)
 Craig, C. T.: 221(C)
 Cross, F. M.: 97(C), 169(C), 172(C), 461(C)
 Crump, F. J.: 111r(A)
 Cullmann, Oscar: (Biog. p. 158), 35(C), 138r(C), 145(A), 193(C), 219(C), 244(C), 393(C), 419(C), 491r(C), 524r(C)
 Cunliffe-Jones, H.: 430(A)
 Cushman, R.: 236(A)
 Cyril of Alexandria, St.: 42(C)
 Cyril of Jerusalem, St.: 42(C), 324r-330r(C)
 Dahl, N. A.: 185(C)
 Dalman: 221(C)
 Dalton, W. J.: 364(A)
 Daniélou, J.: 11r(C), 163(C), 237(A), 366(C)
 Danker, F.: 238(A)
 D'Aragon, J. L.: 499r(B)
 Daube, David: 281(A), 357r(B)
 Davies, W.: 172(C)
 Davis, C.: 80(A)
 Davis, Paul E.: 345r(B)
 Dax: 140r(C)
 Dellagiacoma, V.: 432(A)
 Delmore, J.: 160(A)
 Demetrius I: 275(C)
 Denis the Carthusian: 59(C)
 Descamps, A.: 52(A), 109r(B), 163(C)
 Descartes: 236(C), 522r(C)
 Desroches, A.: 365(A)
 van Deursen, A.: 348r-352r(A)
 Dewailly, L. M.: 6r(B), 117r(B)
 Dibelius, Martin: 212(C)
 Didache: 441(C), 472(C)
 Didascalia Apostolorum: 449(C)
 Diehl, E.: 264(C)
 Dinkler, E.: 81(A)
 Dix, G.: 235(C)
 Dodd, Charles H.: (Biog. p. 158), 57(C), 73r(B), 107r(C), 185(C), 193(C), 212(C), 294r-295r(A), 309r(C), 311r(C), 399(C), 503r(C), 510r(C)
 Dodds, E. R.: 209(C)
 Doeve, J. W.: 51(C), 171r(A)
 Donnelly, Philip J.: 204(A)
 Dothan, M.: 461(C)
 Dougherty, J. J.: 493r(B)
 Draper, H.: 25(A), 180(C)
 Dubarle, A.: 112(A)
 Duhm, B.: 126(C)
 Dulles, Avery: 239(A)
 Duncan, G.: 94(C)
 Duplacy, J.: 255(A), 414(A), 433(A)
 Dupont, J.: 86(C), 113(A), 152(A), 182(A), 299r(C)
 Dupont-Sommer, A.: 163(C), 167(C), 172(C), 267(A), 273(C), 275(C), 473(C)
 Dupois, R.: 114r(A)
 Duquoc, Ch.: 419(A)
 Durand, I.: 42(C)
 Durrwell, F. X.: 115r(A)
 Dyson, Robert A.: 39(A), 518r(B)
 Edgar, C. G.: 22(C)
 Egeria: 454(C)
 Eichrodt, W.: 366(A)
 Eissfeldt, O.: 126(C)
 Engnell, I.: 127(C)
 Ephrem, St.: 18(C), 42(C)
 Epiphanius, St.: 42(C)
 Eschlimann, P.: 78(C)
 Euripides: 209(C)
 Eusebius: 42(C), 324r(C), 396(C), 400(C), 462(C)
 Euthalius: 178(C)
 Evagrius: 178(C), 363(C)
 Evans, C. F.: 116(A), 296r-297r(A)
 Evdokimov, P.: 408A
 Fahy, T.: 207(A)
 Falco, Samuele: 411(C)
 Farrer, Austin M.: 32(C), 33(A), 45(A), 298r-299r(A), 344r(B), 346r-347r(A), 517r(A)
 Faw, Chalmer E.: 342r(B), 394(A)
 Fenton, J. C.: 300r-301r(A), 489r(B)
 Fernández, A.: 11r(C)
 Feuillet, A.: 86(A), 90(A), 224(A)
 Fillion, L.: 42(C)
 Filson, F. V.: 391(A)
 Finegan, J.: 74(A)
 FitzGerald, G. M.: 153(A)
 Fitzmeyer, J.: 287r(B)
 Flanagan, N. M.: 202(A)
 Foerster, Werner: 356r-358r(A)
 Fonseca, L. G.: 343r(B)
 Fournelle, G. G.: 409(A)
 François-Poncet: 458(C)

- Fransen, I.: 87(A), 425(A)
 Franzelin, J.: 174(C), 427(C)
 Franzmann, M.: 75(A)
 Free, J. P.: 461(C)
 Frick, R.: 353r-355r(A)
 Fridrichsen, A.: 117r(A), 244(C)
 Friedrich, G.: 12r(A), 439(C)
 Le Frois, B.: 101(C), 201(C)
 Frost, S. B.: 507r(B)
 Fuller, R.: 524r(B)
 Fuller, R. C.: 179(A), 479(A)
 Fuller, R. H.: 118r(A), 491r(B), 517r(A)
- Gächter, P.: 202(C), 380(C), 495r(B)
 Gärtner, B.: 212(C)
 Gallus, T.: 199(A)
 Garrigou-Lagrange: 412(C)
 Gaugler, E.: 119r(A)
 Gauthier, R.: 412(A)
 Geerlings, Jacob: 335r(B)
 Geiger, M.: 120r(A)
 Gelin, A.: 352r(B)
 George, A.: 141(A), 231(A), 389(A)
 George, H. W.: 103(A)
 Gesenius: 271(C)
 Geyser, A. S.: 46(A)
 Gibley, J.: 109r(A), 401(A), 402(A)
 Gibson, R. E.: 367(A)
 Giet, S.: 368(A)
 Gil Ulecia, A.: 369(A)
 Giraudo, M.: 434(A)
 Glasson, T. Francis: 56(A)
 Glueck, N.: 461(C)
 Gnika, J.: 527r(A)
 Godefroid, J.: 142(A)
 Gogarten, F.: 519r(A), 524r(C)
 Gogler, R.: 17(A)
 Goldstein, M.: 172(C)
 Gomá Civit, I.: 121r(A)
 Goodenough, E. R.: 456(A), 457(A)
 Goodspeed, Edgar J.: (Biog. p. 237)
 González Ruiz, J. M.: 91r(A), 92r(A)
 Grabar, André: 462(C)
 deGrandmaison: 436(C)
 Grant: (Biog. p. 237), 176(C)
 Grassi, Joseph: 340r(B)
 Graystone, Geoffrey: (Biog. p. 238), 161r(A), 193(C), 268(A), 283r-292r(A)
 Green, Humphrey: 193(C)
 Greenlee, J.: 324r-330r(A)
 Greeven, Heinrich: 487r(B)
 Gregory: 370(C)
 Gregory I (The Great), St.: 42(C)
 Gregory of Nyssa, St.: 49(C)
 Greig, J. C. G.: 514r(A)
 Griffe, E.: 458(A)
 Griffiths, B.: 522r(B)
 Griffiths, David R.: 193(A)
 Grobel, K.: 512r(A)
 Grollenberg, L. H.: 348r-352r(A), 455(C)
 Grossouw, W.: 57(A), 163(C), 406(C), 503r(B)
 Gryglewicz, F.: 122(A), 444(C)
 Gschwind, K.: 42(C)
 Guardini, R.: 199(C)
 Guillet, J.: 143(A)
 Gutenberg, J.: 369(C)
 Guthrie, D.: 226(A)
 Guy, Harold A.: 26r(A), 398(A), 488r(A)
- Haberman, A.: 269(A), 476(C)
 Hackett, J.: 209(A)
 Hamilton, W.: 509r(B)
 Hamman, A.: 70(A), 76(A)
 Hanson, R.: 85r(A)
 Haring, Père: 431(C)
 Harms, H. H.: 353r-355r(A)
 Harnack, A.: 195(C), 244(C)
 Haroutunian, I.: 240(A)
 Harrison, P. N.: 94(A)
 Harvey, J.: 500r(B)
- Haugg: 202(C)
 Hebert, G.: 435(A)
 Heidegger: 520r(C)
 Hempel, J.: 277(C)
 Henderson, J.: 515r(B)
 Hendriksen, W.: 93r(B)
 Henry, P.: 174(C)
 Henson, B.: 208(A)
 Héring, J.: 96r(A), 123r(A)
 Hermas, Shepherd: 441(C), 472(C)
 Hertz: 403(C)
 Heussi, K.: 65(C)
 Hilary of Poitiers, St.: 42(C)
 Hippolytus, St.: 42(C)
 Hirsch, Emmanuel: 120r(C)
 Hoeg, Carsten: 324r-330r(A), 331r-336r(A)
 Hohenstein, H. H.: 228(A)
 Holl: 244(C)
 Holstein, H.: 436(A)
 Holtzmann: 399(C)
 Honore, J.: 524r(B)
 Hooke, S.: 126(C)
 Hort: 501r(C)
 Hoskyns: 503r(C)
 Howlett, D.: 166(C)
 Hrabanus Maurus: 437(C)
 Huffman, N.: 370(A), 493r(B)
 Huhn, J.: 437(A)
 Hull, B.: 67(A)
 Hunt, A. S.: 22(C)
 Hunter, A. M.: 492r(A), 497r(B), 505r(B)
 Hyatt, J. Philip: 126(C), 162(A)
 Hyldahl, R.: 82(A)
- Ignatius of Antioch, St.: 42(C), 74(C), 235(C)
 Ignatius of Loyola, St.: 472(C)
 Innitzer, Cardinal: 380(C)
 Irenaeus, St.: 36(C), 42(C), 458(C)
- Jacobs, L.: 403(A)
 Jankowski, B.: 38r(A)
 Jannaues, Alexander: see "Alexander"
 Jaubert, A.: 184(C), 237(C)
 Jeremias, J.: 3r(A), 27r(A), 124r(A), 138r(C), 181(C)
 Jerome, St.: 42(C), 179(C), 261(C), 364(C), 407(C), 411(C), 462(C)
 Joest, W.: 353r-355r(A)
 John Hyrcanus I: 278(C), 467(C)
 Johnson, L.: 217(A)
 Johnson, N.: 172(C)
 Johnson, S. E.: 295r(B), 297r(B), 299r(B), 306r(B)
 Johnston, L.: 241(A), 291r(B)
 Jones, Alexander: (Biog. p. 238), 20(A), 242(A), 270(A), 468(A)
 Jones, C. P. M.: 302r-303r(A)
 Jones, G. V.: 146(A), 147(A), 243(A)
 Jordan, P.: 438(A)
 Josephus: 31(C), 46(C), 163(C), 181(C), 198(C), 267(C), 279(C), 282(C), 368(C), 454(C), 455(C), 466(C), 469(C), 528r(C)
 Joüon, P.: 271(C)
 Jugie, M.: 199(C)
 Juster: 181(C)
 Justin: 400(C), 443(C)
- Käsemann: 494r(C), 495r(B)
 Kahle, Paul: 464(C)
 Kant: 521r(C)
 Kattenbusch: 244(C)
 Keim, T.: 125(C)
 Kelso, J. L.: 461(C)
 Kennedy, H. A. A.: 84(C)
 Kenyon, K. M.: 461(C)
 Kepler, Thomas S.: 489r(B)
 Kerrigan, A.: 163(A)
 Kilpatrick, G. D.: 45(C), 181(C), 304r-305r(A)
 Kittel, Gerhard: 12r(A), 337r(C), 439(C)
 Klausner, J.: 280(C)

- Kleinhaus, A.: 500r(B)
 Klinck, A.: 173r(B)
 Knabenbauer, J.: 42(C)
 Knight, G.: 172(C)
 Knight, H.: 510r(A)
 Knott, B. I.: 264(A)
 Knox, Ronald: 28r(A)
 Knox, Wilfred L.: 185(C), 486r(A)
 de Koninck, C.: 199(C)
 Kossen, H. B.: 51(A)
 Kredel, E. M.: 125(A), 244(A)
 Krieger, N.: 379(A), 410(A)
 Kuchler, W.: 525r(C)
 Kuemmel, F.: 215(C)
 Kürzinger, J.: 527r(B), 529r(B)
 Kuhl: 455(C)
 Kuhn, G.: 163(C)
 Kuhn, K.: 469(A)
 Kuss, O.: 77(A), 218(A), 491r(B), 495r(B)
- Labigne, J.: 29r(A)
 Lagrange, M. J.: 42(C), 503r(C)
 Lake, K.: 19(C), 212(C)
 Lake, S.: 324r-330r(A)
 Lampe, G. W. H.: 306r(A)
 Landersdorfer, S.: 202(C)
 de Langhe, R.: 109r(A)
 Lanne, D. E.: 219(A)
 Laurentin, R.: 191(A), 199(C)
 Lavergne, C.: 14r(B), 114r(B)
 Leaney, R.: 49(A), 176(C), 520r(B)
 Leeming, B.: 39(A)
 De Leeuw, V.: 109r(A)
 Leibrecht: 521r(B)
 Leloir, L.: 18(C)
 Leo XIII, Pope: 59(C), 174(C)
 Léon-Dufour, F.: 185(C), 524r(B)
 Lerch, O.: 366(C)
 Letousey, A.: 29r(A)
 Levie, J.: 13(A), 185(C), 330r(B), 336r(B), 343r-345r(C)
 Licht, J.: 470(A)
 Liebermann, P.: 172(C)
 Lightfoot, J. B.: 125(C)
 Lightfoot, Robert H.: 293r-314r(C)
 Lindblom, J.: 126(C)
 Lindhagen, C.: 126(A), 127(A)
 Ling, T.: 223(A), 418(C)
 Loisy: 399(C)
 Lovsky, F.: 130(C)
 Lucas of Bruges: 42(C)
 Luther, Martin: 120r(C), 128r(C), 225(C)
 Lyonnet, S.: 78(A), 105(A), 215(C), 420(A), 439(A)
- Macarius Manetes: 432(C)
 MacKinnon, D. M.: 307r-308r(A)
 Macquarrie, J.: 245(A), 246(A), 520r(B)
 Maldfeld, G.: 177(A)
 Maldonatus, J.: 42(C), 67(C)
 Malevez, L.: 148r(A), 523r(A)
 Du Manoir: 199(C)
 Manson, T. W.: 107r(C), 212(C), 309r-310r(A)
 Manson, W.: 395(A)
 Monsoor: 473(C)
 Marchand, J. W.: 178(A)
 Marcion: 525r(C)
 Marcus, R.: 471(A)
 Maries, L.: 18(A)
 Marsh, J.: 504r(A)
 Martial: 74(C)
 Martin, C.: 353r(B)
 Martin, Victor: 177(C), 371(A)
 Martin, W. H. Blyth: 32(A), 33(C)
 Martindale, C. C.: 48(A)
 Martini, C.: 472(A)
 Mathon, G.: 524r(B)
 Mauris, E.: 122(C)
 May, Eric: 317r(B)
 McCasland, S. Vernon: 356r(B)
- McCool, Francis J.: 185(A), 485r(B)
 Mechineau: 436(C)
 Meecham, H. G.: 328r(B)
 Mehlman, J.: 197(A)
 Ménard, J. E.: 415(A)
 Mercurio, R.: 285r(B)
 Metzger, Bruce M.: (Biog. p. 238), 14r(A), 95(A), 319r(B), 331r-336r(A)
 de Meulemeester, M.: 411(A)
 Meyer, Eduard: 486r(C)
 Meyer, Paul W.: 404(A), 489r(B)
 Meysels, T. F.: 459(A)
 Michaelis, W.: 4r(A), 78(C)
 Michel, A.: 247(A)
 Michl, J.: 261(A), 380(A)
 Milik, J. T.: 38r(B), 44(C), 272(C), 461(C)
 Minear, P. S.: 491r(B)
 Mitton, C. L.: 90(C), 226(C), 485r(B), 495r(B)
 Möhler, J. A.: 427(C)
 Moeller, C.: 101(C)
 Moffatt, J.: 26r(C)
 Mohrmann, C.: 248(A)
 Mollat, Donatien: 79(A), 104(A), 193(C)
 Montefiore, H. W.: 505r(B)
 Moore, G.: 172(C)
 Moriarty, Frederick L.: 286r(B), 288r(B), 359r(B)
 Moule, C. F. D.: 297r(B), 305r(B), 312r(B), 440(A), 497r(B)
 Mowinckel, Sigmund: 109r(C), 126(C), 127(C), 473(A)
 Mowry, Lucetta: 172(C), 193(C)
 Mueller, J.: 85r(B)
 Muilenburg, J.: 461(C)
 Munck, Johannes: 215(C), 219(C), 490r(A)
 Murphy, Roland E.: 164(A), 165(A), 290r(C), 292r(B), 361r(B)
 Mussner, F.: 50(A), 494r(A)
 Musurillo, Herbert: 441(A)
- Neil, W.: 183(A)
 Neiryneck, F.: 11r(B)
 Nelson, J. R.: 442r(A), 497r(B)
 Nineham, D. E.: 32(C), 293r(A), 311r-312r(A), 315r(B)
 Noack, H.: 353r-355r(A)
 Nober, P.: 355r(B), 491r(B), 524r(B)
 Noetscher, F.: 42(C)
 Norden, E.: 209(C)
 North, C. R.: 127(C)
 North, Robert: 272(A)
 Nyberg, H.: 127(C)
 Nygren, A.: 128r(A)
- Obermann, Julian: 474(A)
 Oesterreicher, J. M.: 273(A)
 O'Flynn, J. A.: 149(A), 360r(B)
 Oke, C. Clare: 227(A)
 Ordoñez, V.: 258(A)
 Origen: 17(C), 38r(C), 176(C), 179(C), 324r(C), 400(C), 407(C)
 O'Rourke, John: 249(A)
 Owens, G.: 205(A)
- Pache, R.: 129r(A)
 Pamphilus: 178(C)
 Papias: 343r(C), 396(C), 488r(C), 525r(C)
 del Paramo, S.: 15r(A)
 Parker, P.: 299r(C), 405(A), 482r(A)
 Parrot, A.: 154r(A)
 Paulinus: 261(C)
 Pavlovsky, V.: 351r(B)
 Peale, N. V.: 367(C)
 Percy, E.: 78(C)
 Perdelwitz, R.: 97(C)
 Perella, D. G. M.: 5r(A)
 Perkins, John Ward: 259(C), 260(C)
 Perrot, M. S.: 461(C)
 Persich, N.: 515r(B)
 Pesch, W.: 30r(A)

- Petrone: 412(C)
 Pfeiffer, R.: 172(C)
 Philo Judaeus: 172(C), 181(C), 282(C), 406(C), 472(C)
 Photius: 19(C)
 Piepkorn, A.: 129r(B), 140r(B)
 Pierce, C. A.: 340r-342r(A)
 Piper, A.: 505r(B)
 Pius X, Pope: 59(C)
 Pius XI, Pope: 59(C)
 Pius XII, Pope: 59(C), 407(C)
 Des Places, E.: 135r(B)
 Plagnieux, J.: 199(A)
 Plantie, J.: 130(A)
 Plato, 84(C)
 Pliny: 400(C)
 Plummer, A.: 221(C)
 Plutarch: 472(C)
 Porphyry: 432(C)
 Porter, H. B., Jr.: 443(A)
 Porter, J.: 212(C)
 de la Potterie, I.: 230(A)
 Prado, Juan: 5r(A)
 Prat, F.: 42(C), 213(C), 216(C), 436(C)
 Preisler, H.: 97(C)
 Preiss, T.: 510r(A)
 Prentice, W.: 210(A)
 Prete, B.: 68r(A), 131(A), 132(A), 444(A)
 Quentin, H.: 369(C)
 Quirinus: 206(C)
 Quispel, G.: 480(A)
 Rabin: 464(C)
 Rabinowitz: 452(C)
 von Rad, G.: 366(C)
 Raeder, M.: 222(A)
 Rahner, K.: 175(A)
 Ramlot, D.: 109r(B)
 Ramsay: 212(C)
 Ramsey, A.: 104(C)
 Reicke, B.: 133(A), 212(C)
 Reid, M. H.: 348r-352r(A)
 Reimarus, S.: 125(C), 244(C)
 Reland: 454(C)
 Rengstorff, K. H.: 113(C)
 Renié, J.: 71r(A)
 Ricciotti, Giuseppe: 78(C)
 Richards, H. J.: 507r(B)
 Ridderbos, H.: 69r(A)
 Riesenfeld, H.: 6r(A), 127(C)
 Rigaux, B.: 109r(A)
 Rigg, H. A., Jr.: 396(A)
 Ringgren, H.: 127(C)
 Robert, A.: 7r(A)
 Roberts, C.: 262(A)
 Robertson, E.: 221(C)
 Robinson, E.: 178(C), 464(C)
 Robinson, H. W.: 126(C)
 Robinson, J. A. T.: 41(A), 188(A), 211(A), 442(C)
 Roller, O.: 78(C)
 Rosenblatt, S.: 381(A)
 Ross, A.: 69r(A)
 Roth, C.: 282(A)
 Rousseau, O.: 16(A)
 Rowley, H. H.: 126(C), 274(A), 275(A), 339r(B), 348r-352r(A), 475(A), 491r(B), 507r(B), 510r(B), 518r(B)
 Rubinstein, A.: 276(A)
 Russell, R.: 58(A)
 Sabbe, M.: 382(A), 383(A)
 Saccardi: 411(C)
 Sahlin, H.: 8r(C)
 Sanders, J. N.: 195(A), 503r(B)
 Saponaro, M.: 526r(A)
 Saturninus: 206(C)
 Scharlemann, M.: 26r(B), 98(A), 108r(B)
 Schechter, S.: 167(C)
 Scheeben: 427(C)
 Schelkle, K. H.: 445(A), 495r(B)
 Schierse, F. J.: 295r(B), 297r(B), 301r(B), 303r(B), 308r(B), 310r(B), 314r(B), 318r(B)
 Schleiermacher, F.: 125(C), 236(C), 244(C)
 Schlier, H.: 250(A), 494r(C)
 Schmid, H.: 185(C)
 Schmid, J.: 483r(B), 485r(B), 487r(B)
 Schmidt, K.: 353r-355r(A)
 Schmidt, Ph.: 384(A)
 Schmitt, Joseph: 193(C)
 Schnackenburg, R.: 498r(A)
 Schneider, H.: 369(C)
 Schniewind, J.: 42(C), 518r(C)
 Schonfield, Hugh J.: 284r(C), 291r(C)
 Schubert, K.: 528r(A)
 Schürer: 180(C), 456(C)
 Schweitzer, A.: 31(C), 195(C), 309r(C)
 Scott, E. F.: 172(C)
 Seesemann, H.: 439(C)
 Segal: 269(C)
 Seufert: 125(C)
 Shattner, J.: 460(A)
 Sheerin, J.: 166(A)
 Shick, G.: 21(A)
 Siberman, L.: 372(A)
 Sickenberger, J.: 42(C)
 Siegman, E. F.: 325r(B), 331r(B)
 Silberman: 473(C)
 Siricius, Pope: 205(C)
 Skydsgaard, K. E.: 355r(C), 427(C)
 Smith, C. R.: 134r(A)
 Smith, J. P.: 327r(B)
 Smith, Morton: 172(C)
 Smith, N. G.: 373(A), 519r(A)
 Smits, C.: 8r(A)
 Smothers, E. R.: 260(A)
 Smyth, K.: 167(A)
 von Soden, W.: 19(C), 178(C), 370(C)
 Sohm, Rudolf: 125(C), 244(C)
 Sontag, F.: 446(A)
 La Sor, W.: 129r(A), 271(A)
 Soucec, J. B.: 447(A)
 Spadafora, F.: 200(A), 413(A)
 Spear: 172(C)
 Spiazzi, R. P.: 251(A), 444(C)
 Spicq, Celsus: 135r(A), 337r-339r(A), 421(A), 493r(B), 524r(B)
 Staab, K.: 525r(A)
 Stählen, G.: 448(A)
 Stamm, R. T.: 503r(B)
 Stanley, D. M.: 136(A), 144(A), 186(A), 193(A)
 Stauffer, E.: 44(A), 137(A), 504r(A)
 Stegemann, H.: 168(A), 277(A)
 Steinmueller, John E.: (Biog. p. 239)
 Stendahl, Krister: (Biog. p. 239), 6r(A), 337r(B)
 Stephen, St.: 449(C)
 Stürmer, K.: 355r(C)
 Suarez, Francis: 67(C)
 Subilia, V.: 138r(A)
 Suitbertus, Fr.: 83(A)
 Sukanik, E. L.: 162(C), 277(C), 464(C), 473(C)
 Surburg, R.: 172(A)
 Sutcliffe, E. F.: 506r(A)
 Swete: 221(C)
 Tasker, R. V. G.: 324r(B)
 Tatian: 323r(C), 329r(C), 331r(C), 399(C)
 Taubes, J.: 372(C)
 Tavard, G. H.: 449(A)
 Taylor, Vincent: 185(C), 192(A), 206(C), 322r(B), 332r(B), 503r(B)
 Telesphorus, Pope: 235(C)
 Tertullian: 42(C), 206(C), 226(C), 400(C)
 Thomas Aquinas, St.: 42(C), 105(C), 128r(C), 365(C), 407(C), 412(C), 428(C)
 Thompson, H. A.: 155(A)
 Thomsen: 455(C)
 Thyges, A.: 59(A), 201(C)
 Tillich, Paul: 236(C), 239(C), 422(C), 446(C)

- Toombs, L. E.: 278(A)
 Torbet, R.: 348r(B)
 Torrance, T. F.: 150(A), 252(A), 440(C), 450(A)
 Tournay, R.: 29r(B), 134r(B)
 Toynbee, Jocelyn: 259(C), 260(C)
 Trémel, Y. B.: 256(A)
 Tricot, A.: 7r(A)
 Trier: 495(C)
 Troadec, H. G.: 385(A)
 Trumpp, J.: 386(A)
 Tseret'eli, Giorgi: 95(C)
 Turner, H. E. W.: 206(A), 398(C)
 Turner, Nigel: 22(C), 392(A)
 Twomey, J. J.: 198(A)
 Twomey, Richard L.: 60(A)

 van Unnik, W. C.: 229(A), 481(A)

 Vaccari, A.: (Biog. p. 159), 39(C)
 Vaganay, L.: 35(C), 185(C), 299r(C), 343r-345r(A), 482r(C)
 de Vaux, Roland: 68r(B), 266(A), 283r(B), 292r(C), 348r-352r(A), 467(A)
 Vawter, B.: 64(A)
 Verity, G. B.: 139r(A), 508r(A)
 Vespasian: 279(C)
 Viard, A.: 483r(B), 489r(B), 491r(B), 493r(B), 495r(B), 497r(B), 500r(B), 503r(B)
 Vicedom, G. F.: 353r-355r(A)
 Vilar, V.: 461(A)
 Vincent, A.: 350r(B)
 Vincent, H.: 462(C)
 Vincent, Louis H.: (Biog. p. 159), 462(A)
 Vincent, Père: 464(C)
 Vittonato, G.: 42(A)
 Vööbus, A.: 319r-323r(A)
 Vogels, H.: 323r(B)
 Vogt, E.: 184(A)
 Voigt, E.: 455(C)
 Voltaire: 412(C)
 Vosté, J.: 42(C)

 Walker, N.: 387(A)

 Webber, O.: 353r-355r(A)
 Wedel, T. O.: 451(A)
 Weijers, M. R.: 8r(B), 63r(B)
 Weitzmann, K.: 374(A)
 Weiss, B.: 125(C)
 Weiss, J.: 125(C), 244(C)
 Wendland, H. D.: 353r-355r(A)
 Wennemer: 499r(B)
 Wernecke, H.: 100r(A)
 Westcott: 501r(C)
 Whiteley, D. E. H.: 341r(B), 422(A), 522r(B)
 Widengren, G.: 127(C)
 Wiegand, E.: 462(C)
 Wikenhauser, A.: 498r(A)
 Wikgren, Allen: 326r(B), 334r(B), 483r(B), 485r(B), 487r(B)
 Wilcox, M.: 416(A)
 Wilder, Amos N.: (Biog. p. 239), 516r(B)
 Willaert, B.: 35(A), 393(A)
 Williams, C. S. C.: 212(A), 503r(B)
 Willmering, H.: 161r(B), 507r(B)
 Wilson, Edmund: 167(C), 283r-288r(C)
 Wilson, R. McL.: 388(A), 406(A)
 Winter, P.: 36(A), 47(A), 192(A)
 Wolff, H. W.: 127(C), 353r-355r(A)
 Wolfson, H.: 172(C)
 Wood, H. G.: 31(A)
 Wrede: 309r(C)
 Wunderlich, L.: 253(A)

 Yadin, Y.: 461(C)
 Young, F. W.: 194(A)

 Zacagnius: 178(C)
 Zähringer: 380(C)
 Zeitlin, Solomon: 169(A), 269(C), 292r(C), 387(C), 476(A), 477(A), 487r(B)
 Zeller, H.: 42(C)
 Zerwick, M.: 39(C), 299r(B), 301r(B), 303r(B), 306r(B), 310r(B), 503r(B)
 Zimmerli, W.: 127(C)
 Zorn, H.: 375(A)
 De Zwaan, J.: 209(C)

LIST OF JOURNALS

With abbreviations for titles of more than one word

(B) indicates journals consulted for book reviews

<i>AC</i>	Antiquité Classique (Bruxelles)	<i>CLR</i>	Clergy Review (London)
<i>AER</i>	American Ecclesiastical Review (Washington)	<i>ColBG</i>	Collationes Brugenses et Gandavenses (Brugge)
<i>AFH</i>	Archivum Franciscanum Historicum (Quaracchi)	<i>ColFranc</i>	Collectanea Franciscana (Roma)
<i>AJA</i>	American Journal of Archaeology (Princeton)	<i>ColMech</i>	Collectanea Mechliniensia (Mechelen- Malines)
<i>AJOE</i>	American Journal of Oriental Ex- ploration	<i>CTM</i>	Concordia Theological Monthly* (St. Louis)
<i>AJP</i>	American Journal of Philology (Baltimore)	<i>DomS</i>	Dominican Studies (Oxford)
<i>ALBO</i>	Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia (Louvain)	<i>DowR</i>	Downside Review (Bath)
<i>AmiCl</i>	Ami du Clergé (Langres) <i>Angelicum</i> (Roma)	<i>DTP</i>	Divus Thomas (Piacenza)
<i>AnglTR</i>	Anglican Theological Review* (Evanston, Ill.) <i>Antonianum</i> (Roma)	<i>DubRev</i>	Dublin Review (London)
<i>AST</i>	Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia (Barcelona)	<i>DViv</i>	Dieu Vivant (Paris)
<i>ATA</i>	Année Théologique Augustinienne (Paris)	<i>EccXav</i>	Ecclesiastica Xaveriana (Bogota)
<i>AusBR</i>	Australian Biblical Review	<i>EglViv</i>	Eglise Vivante (Paris-Louvain)
<i>AusCRec</i>	Australasian Catholic Record (Sydney)	<i>EphLit</i>	Ephemerides Liturgicae (Roma)
<i>BA</i>	Biblical Archaeologist (New Haven)	<i>EphMar</i>	Ephemerides Mariologicae (Madrid)
<i>BASOR</i>	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research (New Haven)	<i>EstBib</i>	Estudios Biblicos (Madrid) (B)
<i>BBLAK</i>	Beiträge zur Biblischen Landes-und Altertumskunde (Stuttgart)	<i>EstEc</i>	Estudios Eclesiásticos (Madrid) (B)
<i>BComm</i>	Bellarmino Commentary (Heythrop, Oxon.)	<i>EstF</i>	Estudios Franciscanos (Barcelona)
<i>BFCL</i>	Bulletin des Facultés Catholiques de Lyon (Lyon) <i>Biblica</i> (Roma) (B)	<i>Etudes</i> (Paris)	
<i>BiblZ</i>	Biblische Zeitschrift	<i>ETL</i>	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovani- enses (Louvain) (B)
<i>BIES</i>	Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society (Jerusalem)	<i>ExpT</i>	Expository Times* (Edinburgh) (B)
<i>BIFAO</i>	Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale (Le Caire)	<i>FS</i>	Franciscan Studies (New York)
<i>BiKi</i>	Bibel und Kirche (Stuttgart)	<i>FSI</i>	Franziskanische Studien (Pader- born)
<i>BiViChrét</i>	Bible et Vie Chrétienne (Paris)	<i>FZPT</i>	Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philos- ophie und Theologie (Freiburg, Switzerland)
<i>BJRyLL</i>	Bulletin of the John Rylands Li- brary* (Manchester) <i>Blackfriars</i> (London)	<i>Gregorianum</i> (Roma)	
<i>BLitE</i>	Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique (Toulouse)	<i>HibJ</i>	Hibbert Journal* (Liverpool)
<i>BndktM</i>	Benediktinische Monatschrift (Beuron)	<i>HJ</i>	Historische Jahrbuch (München)
<i>BO</i>	Bibliotheca Orientalis (Leiden)	<i>HPR</i>	Homiletic and Pastoral Review (New York)
<i>BPT</i>	Bijdragen Tijdschrift voor Philos- ophie en Theologie (Nijmegen) <i>Bridge</i> (Newark)	<i>HTR</i>	Harvard Theological Review* (Cambridge, Mass.)
<i>BTAM</i>	Bulletin de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale (Louvain)	<i>IEJ</i>	Israel Exploration Journal (Jerusalem)
<i>CahSi</i>	Cahiers Sioniens (Paris)	<i>ILN</i>	Illustrated London News (London)
<i>CanJT</i>	Canadian Journal of Theology*	<i>Interpretation*</i> (Richmond)	
<i>CapA</i>	Capuchin Annual	<i>Irénikon</i> (Chevetogne)	
<i>CBQ</i>	Catholic Biblical Quarterly (Wash- ington) (B)	<i>IrER</i>	Irish Ecclesiastical Record (Dublin)
<i>CC</i>	Civiltà Cattolica (Roma)	<i>IrTQ</i>	Irish Theological Quarterly (May- nooth) (B)
<i>ChC</i>	Christian Century* (Chicago)	<i>Istina</i> (Boulogne-Sur-Seine)	
<i>ChQR</i>	Church Quarterly Review* (London) <i>Christus</i> (Lyon)	<i>ItF</i>	Italia Franciscana
<i>CiTom</i>	Ciencia Tomista (Salamanca)	<i>JA</i>	Journal Asiatique (Paris)
<i>CLM</i>	Clergy Monthly (Ranchi)	<i>JAOS</i>	Journal of the American Oriental Society (New Haven)
		<i>JBL</i>	Journal of Biblical Literature* (Philadelphia) (B)
		<i>JBR</i>	Journal of Bible and Religion* (Boston)
		<i>JEH</i>	Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (Manchester)
		<i>JHS</i>	Journal of Hellenic Studies (London)
		<i>JIS</i>	Journal of Jewish Studies* (Cambridge, England)
		<i>JNES</i>	Journal of Near Eastern Studies (Chicago)
		<i>JQR</i>	Jewish Quarterly Review* (Phila.)
		<i>JR</i>	Journal of Religion* (Chicago) (B)
		<i>JRAS</i>	Journal of the Royal Asiatic So- ciety (London)

LIST OF JOURNALS (Continued)

<i>JRS</i>	Journal of Roman Studies (London)	<i>RSPT</i>	Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques (Paris) (B)
<i>JSS</i>	Journal of Semitic Studies* (Manchester)	<i>RstaB</i>	Revista Biblica (La Plata)
<i>JTS</i>	Journal of Theological Studies* (Oxford) (B)	<i>RTAM</i>	Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale (Louvain)
	<i>Judaism*</i> (New York)	<i>RTh</i>	Revue Thomiste (Paris) (B)
<i>LS</i>	Life of the Spirit (London)	<i>RUO</i>	Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa (Ottawa)
	<i>Listener</i> (London)	<i>SacDoc</i>	Sacra Doctrina (Bologna)
<i>LumenV</i>	Lumen Vitae (Bruxelles)		<i>Salmanticensis</i> (Salamanca)
<i>LumVi</i>	Lumière et Vie (St. Alban-Leyse)		<i>Sapienza</i> (Roma)
<i>LumViS</i>	Lumière et Vie, Supplément biblique de "Paroisse et Liturgie" (Bruges)	<i>SBFLA</i>	Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus
<i>MarSt</i>	Marian Studies (New York)		<i>Scholastik</i> (Freiburg/Br.) (B)
<i>MiscC</i>	Miscelánea Comillas (Santander)	<i>ScEcc</i>	Sciences Écclésiastiques (Montréal)
<i>MiscF</i>	Miscellanea Franciscana		<i>Scripture</i> (Edinburgh) (B)
<i>MSR</i>	Mélanges de Science Religieuse (Lille)	<i>ScuolC</i>	Scuola Cattolica (Milano)
	<i>Month</i> (London)	<i>SDZ</i>	Stimmen der Zeit (Freiburg/Br.)
<i>MTZ</i>	Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift (München)	<i>ST</i>	Studia Theologica* (Lund)
	<i>Muséon</i> (Louvain)	<i>StCat</i>	Studia Catholica (Nijmegen)
<i>NatGeo</i>	National Geographic Magazine (Washington)		<i>Studies</i> (Dublin)
<i>NovT</i>	Novum Testamentum* (Leiden)	<i>StF</i>	Studi Francescani (Firenze)
<i>NRT</i>	Nouvelle Revue Théologique (Tournai) (B)		<i>Tablet</i> (London)
<i>NTS</i>	New Testament Studies* (Cambridge, England) (B)	<i>TD</i>	Theology Digest (St. Marys, Kan.)
	<i>Orientalia</i> (Roma)	<i>TG</i>	Theologie und Glaube (Paderborn)
<i>OCP</i>	Orientalia Christiana Periodica (Roma)	<i>TL</i>	Theologische Literaturzeitung* (Leipzig) (B)
<i>OrSyr</i>	Orient Syrien (Paris)	<i>TLitS</i>	Times Literary Supplement* (London) (B)
<i>PEQ</i>	Palestine Exploration Quarterly (London)	<i>TPQ</i>	Theologische Praktische Quartal- schrift (Linz)
<i>ParLit</i>	Paroisse et Liturgie (Bruges)	<i>TQ</i>	Theologische Quartalschrift (Tübingen)
	<i>Philologus</i> (Wiesbaden)	<i>TRev</i>	Theologische Revue (Münster) (B)
<i>PJB</i>	Palästina-Jahrbuch	<i>TRu</i>	Theologische Rundschau* (Tübingen)
<i>ProcCTS</i>	Proceedings of the Catholic Theo- logical Society of America (Wash- ington)	<i>TS</i>	Theological Studies (Baltimore) (B)
<i>RAC</i>	Rivista di Archeologia Christiana (Roma)		<i>Thought</i> (New York)
<i>RAscMys</i>	Revue d'Ascétique et Mystique (Toulouse)	<i>TTZ</i>	Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* (Trier)
<i>RB</i>	Revue Biblique (Jerusalem) (B)	<i>TZ</i>	Theologische Zeitschrift* (Basel)
<i>RBib</i>	Rivista Biblica		<i>Unitas</i> (Roma)
<i>REspir</i>	Revista de Espiritualidad	<i>VD</i>	Verbum Domini (Roma)
<i>RET</i>	Revista Española de Teologia (Madrid)	<i>ViCh</i>	Vigiliae Christianae (Amsterdam)
<i>RevBen</i>	Revue Bénédictine (Maredsous)	<i>Vielnt</i>	Vie Intellectuelle (Paris)
<i>RHE</i>	Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (Louvain)	<i>VieSp</i>	Vie Spirituelle (Paris)
<i>RHPR</i>	Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse (Paris)	<i>VyL</i>	Virtud y Letras (Manizales, Colombia)
<i>RHR</i>	Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (Paris)	<i>WW</i>	Wissenschaft und Weisheit (Düsseldorf)
<i>RPh</i>	Revue de Philologie (Paris)	<i>WZKM</i>	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes (Wien)
<i>RQCAK</i>	Römische Quartalschrift für Christ- liche Alterkunds und Kirchen- geschichte (Freiburg)		<i>Worship</i> (Collegeville, Minn.)
<i>RRel</i>	Review for Religious (St. Marys, Kansas)	<i>ZDMG</i>	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgen- ländischen Gesellschaft (Wies- baden)
<i>RScRel</i>	Revue des Sciences Religieuses (Strasbourg) (B)	<i>ZDPV</i>	Zeitschrift des Deutschen-Palästi- navereins
<i>RSR</i>	Recherches de Science Religieuse (Paris) (B)	<i>ZKG</i>	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte (Stuttgart)
		<i>ZKT</i>	Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie (Wien) (B)
		<i>ZNW</i>	Zeitschrift für die Neutestament- liche Wissenschaft* (Berlin)
		<i>ZRG</i>	Zeitschrift für Religions und Geis- tesgeschichte* (Erlangen)

